

SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 487, Vol. 19.

February 25, 1865.

Price 6d.
Stamped 7d.

LORD RUSSELL ON THE CONSTITUTION.

LORD RUSSELL has republished, after an interval of more than forty years, his work on the English Constitution, with the legitimate purpose of proving that the statesmen of his own generation have deserved well of their country. The book itself was known to modern readers only by name, and as a political treatise it no longer possesses any considerable value; but it forms a curious historical record by presenting, in the shape of prophecy and recommendation, numerous measures which have long since received their historical completion. Lord RUSSELL's early speculations are not, perhaps, extraordinarily profound or original, but they are distinguished by moderation and good sense. It is remarkable that so devoted an admirer of Fox should, even in his youth, have avoided the factious extravagance which too often deformed his master's patriotism and genius. It is true that the Whigs of 1823 were more happily situated than their political ancestors of the previous generation. Fox threw away great opportunities by making himself personally offensive to the King, and by adopting, during the French Revolution, opinions which were justly odious to the sounder part of the nation. The ally of the Jacobins and the apologist of BONAPARTE wasted the vigour of intellect and liberality of judgment which, in other times, might have exercised a beneficent influence on legislation and on government. It was impossible to commence a systematic reform of abuses until some years had elapsed after the close of the great European war. Lord JOHN RUSSELL entered public life under the happiest conditions, when his party, though it still formed a minority in Parliament, had appropriated to itself the advocacy of doctrines which were visibly destined to extend and to triumph. Under the mild Toryism of Lord LIVERPOOL, there was little temptation to rush into the opposite extreme of democratic and seditious agitation. Fox professed to rejoice in a fall in the funds, because PITT would be annoyed; and, when a French invasion was expected, he declared that, despot for despot, the absolutism of BONAPARTE would scarcely be more obnoxious than the absolutism of GEORGE III. During the long supremacy of his rival, he despaired of recovering power, and of effecting any of the changes which he considered essential to the preservation of freedom; but his successors had the good fortune to see before them, as practicable achievements, the political emancipation of the Roman Catholics, the mitigation of the criminal law, the relaxation of commercial restrictions, and the abolition of West Indian slavery. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, following in the footsteps of Lord GREY, was fortunate enough to add to the creed of his party the article of Parliamentary Reform, which will be inseparably associated with his name. In the Liberalism of 1820, as in all popular persuasions, there was abundance of shallowness and of presumption. The Whigs supposed that Catholicism, at least in England, was an obsolete prejudice which was only sustained by a gentleman-like instinct of resistance to injustice. As Lord MELBOURNE is reported to have said, long after the Act of Emancipation, all the sensible men were on one side and all the fools on the other, and everything that the fools foretold had turned out literally true. The philanthropists asserted that free negroes would work harder than slaves; and again the fools, who said that the planters would be ruined, found their warnings confirmed by the event. Yet it was right to abolish the disabilities of the Roman Catholics, and to emancipate the slaves. The other changes which followed the accession of the Whigs to power have been still more obviously and immediately beneficial.

Reviewing his long experience, Lord RUSSELL has naturally been impressed by the great changes in the condition of the country which have been effected since the commencement of his own political career. Instead of recasting his youthful Essay, he has judiciously prefixed an Introduction, in which he compares, with a not unbecoming complacency, the promise

of his life with its performance. The well-known story of the preparation of the Reform Bill is briefly and modestly recapitulated, and the acknowledged success of the measure is illustrated by the familiar enumeration of its principal results. The party conflicts and intrigues which would form a less agreeable topic are fortunately irrelevant to the present purpose. Lord RUSSELL pays a graceful tribute to the memory of his most famous opponent, and he refers with a warmer feeling to the lost political associates whose greatness he excusably overrates. Incidentally, he finds occasion to defend himself against the attacks which have been recently made on his conduct and opinions. It seems that, when he quoted to a Scotch audience the well known motto, "Rest and be thankful," as appropriate to the summit of a hill, he expressly guarded himself against the assumption that the journey was over, and that no other hills remained to be climbed. The matter is of little importance, but orators ought to recollect that, when they ornament their speech with a proverb or an epigram, the crystallized substance remains long after the ordinary prosaic context has passed into natural decay. As to the Danish question, Lord RUSSELL confines himself to the remark that the weaker party is not necessarily in the right, and that the Danes might have avoided the disasters which overwhelmed them if they had accepted the advice which was tendered by the English Government in the autumn of 1862. The apology is literally just, though it is far from covering the whole ground of controversy. If Lord RUSSELL's despatch had closed the correspondence, and if the absurd date of "Coburg" had been erased, the case of the Foreign Office would have been impregnable to criticism. It is satisfactory to find that the veteran Minister protests with all his force against the new-fangled heresy of perpetual non-interference, which would be equivalent to systematic toleration of wrongful interference.

The most interesting part of the Introduction consists in a direct traverse or repudiation of Mr. GLADSTONE's mischievous theory of Parliamentary Reform. Lord RUSSELL, while he still professes a desire to introduce further changes in the representative system, confines himself to those reasons for extending the franchise which may be deduced from public expediency. He is not of the opinion which his colleague held for a week, or perhaps for a minute, that every unconvicted man has, like an absolute king, a right divine to govern wrong. It might be expected that an elderly statesman would be wiser than his inexperienced son; but Lord RUSSELL's book proves that, even when he had his career before him, he abstained from propounding revolutionary schemes of reform for the House of Commons, and from talking nonsense about the House of Lords. He has often been laughed at for a somewhat pedantic faith in Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, and he has made SOMERS almost as tiresome as ARISTIDES; yet Magna Charta is incomparably more valuable than the Rights of Man, and Lord SOMERS is a safer guide than Mr. BRIGHT, or than Mr. GLADSTONE in his ultra-Liberal moods. The English Constitution was Lord RUSSELL's idol in his youth, and he is incapable of infidelity in old age. He delights to prove that the constituency of the Reform Bill represents, with approximate accuracy, the freeholders and burgesses of the original Parliamentary system. It is not clear what additional edifice he would erect on the old constitutional foundation. In common with all reasonable politicians, he would gladly enfranchise the aristocracy of the working classes, but he also appears to share the general inability to devise a plan for the exclusive admission of duly qualified electors.

The canon, or principle, of adhering to historical analogy has guided Lord RUSSELL to a sound conclusion in the question of artificial protection to the minority. He justly considers that a graduated franchise would be an invidious novelty, and he mentions with diffidence a proposal, which was included in one of his own Reform Bills, for allowing only a double vote when three members are to be elected. This device is, in fact,

the most plausible of the ingenious schemes which have been contrived to palliate the evils of Reform. It is possible that so small an innovation might be allowed to pass, and the operation of the plan would probably be beneficial. The more elaborate complications of electoral machinery which are recommended by Lord GREY and Mr. HARE are fit only to serve as intellectual amusements. When statesmen have to defend a position which is necessarily unpopular, it is their business to avail themselves of the natural accidents of the ground, instead of raising ostentatious works of their own. The minority is more or less effectually protected at present by the limitations of the franchise, by the dissimilarity of different constituencies, and especially by their great inequality in numbers. The community is accustomed to irregularities which are tolerable because they exist, although only the more intelligent class of politicians appreciate their real utility. A borough is a borough, and a county is a county, and it seems natural that every political unit should be counted in the Constitution. The sunbeam is, in conformity with English usage, intercepted on its way, and not retrospectively extracted from the cucumber. Democrats are dangerous politicians, and their encroachments must be occasionally resisted; but it is idle and presumptuous to treat them like children, by giving them power and preventing them from using it at their pleasure. The founders of the American Federation were laudably anxious to break the level flow of democratic omnipotence, by various franchises, and by the interposition of responsible electors between the constituency and the supreme magistrate. In two or three generations nearly all their barriers have been swept away, with the exception of the unequal representation in the Senate, which corresponds to the irregular apportionment of members to English boroughs. Rhode Island and New Hampshire are in the Upper House on a level with New York, as Tiverton is represented equally with Leeds. To this extent alone the American minority is secured against oppression, and if equal electoral divisions were instituted in England, it may be doubted whether a similar function could be effectually discharged by the House of Lords. Lord RUSSELL's political life is approaching its close, while Mr. GLADSTONE has still a future before him. As far as their opinions or tendencies differ, the statesman of the older generation represents a safer school of doctrine than the more recent convert to Reform.

AMERICA.

THE recent negotiations for peace at Fortress Monroe are reported with a marked difference of tone by the parties to the Conference. The Federal Government evidently desires to encourage the hope that peace is not unattainable, while Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS protests with unwonted vehemence against proposals which he represents as insults to the South. Mr. LINCOLN states that "by the other party it was not said that in any event, or in any condition, would they ever consent to reunion, and yet they equally omitted to declare that they would (? not) so consent. They seemed to desire a postponement of that question, and the adoption of some other course first, which, as some of them seemed to argue, might or might not lead to reunion." Mr. SEWARD introduces an additional element into his account of the discussion by informing Mr. ADAMS that "what the insurgent party seemed chiefly to favour was a postponement of the question of separation upon which the war is waged, and a mutual direction of the efforts of the Government as well as of the insurgents to some extrinsic policy or scheme for a season, during which passions might be expected to subside and the armies be reduced, and trade and intercourse between the people of both nations might be resumed." The nature of the "extrinsic policy or scheme" which was to be substituted for the present quarrel is sufficiently indicated in the statement of a Richmond paper, that Mr. LINCOLN and Mr. SEWARD were understood, in the course of the conversation, to anticipate some complication in their foreign relations, and rather with England than with France. It is probable that the ingenious suggestion proceeded from the Secretary of State, and not, as he insinuates, from the Commissioners, since the PRESIDENT abstains from any mention of the subject. In plain terms, it was proposed, on one side or both, that the belligerents should unite in a wanton attack upon England, as a convenient diversion for excited passions. Threats of the kind have been frequently employed by the Confederate organs at Richmond and in London; but there is more excuse for the injudicious efforts of the weaker party to extort recognition than for the profligate offer to the South of complicity in a great crime as the price of reunion. It is not easy to understand how a foreign war would facilitate the

reduction of the armies, but it is certain that an extrinsic policy or scheme means an attack either on Canada or on Mexico. Mr. SEWARD, in conclusion, professes to believe that some advantage has been gained by the opportunity of laying the views of the Federal Government before some of the principal insurgents, and by listening to their representations in a courteous and friendly manner. If the Southern Commissioners had any serious object, they apparently desired to obtain an armistice, which the PRESIDENT was fully determined to refuse. If negotiation on the subject had been found practicable, the question of independence or reunion would have been temporarily left in abeyance. The proposed alliance against some foreign enemy or victim would have served as a provisional substitute for federation, and perhaps as a stage towards reunion.

It is not unnatural that the Federal Government should promote to the utmost of its power any division of opinion which may exist among the Southern leaders. There is reason to believe that Mr. DAVIS has consistently disbelieved in the efficacy of negotiation. Mr. LINCOLN has made no secret of his determination to insist on the restoration of the Union, and on the abolition of slavery; and during the interview at Fortress Monroe he steadily adhered to the same hard conditions. Mr. STEPHENS, however, and one or both of his colleagues, belonged to the Richmond peace party, and the Confederate PRESIDENT thought it prudent both to exhibit his own pacific disposition and to obtain an official statement of the enemy's demands. Unless General GRANT misunderstood the language of the Commissioners, two of their number must differ widely in opinion from the head of their Government. General GRANT informed the PRESIDENT that "he was convinced, on conversation with Mr. STEPHENS and Mr. HUNTER, that their intentions were good, and their desire sincere to restore peace and union." The Commissioners themselves would perhaps allege that the peace which they proposed was between two independent Powers, and that the contingent reunion was to be purely voluntary. If, however, Mr. STEPHENS were to succeed to the Confederate Presidency, he would probably be found more pliable than his predecessor. It was only on the arrival of General GRANT's confidential communication that Mr. LINCOLN determined to meet the Southern Commissioners. There had been little encouragement in the exchange of notes in which one President spoke of "the two countries," and the other of "our common country." Mr. DAVIS, by his subsequent speech at Richmond, evidently desired to prevent any further attempts at negotiation. He declared that the Confederacy should not again "be insulted by such terms as the arrogance of the enemy has proposed;" and with questionable taste he anticipated the time when, "in talking to us, they should learn that they were talking to their masters." In graver and weightier language Mr. DAVIS personally pledged himself never to consent to the restoration of the Union. As he truly stated, the enemy demanded an unconditional surrender, and he more than once avowed his preference for the alternative of an honourable grave. It is now certain that one more campaign will intervene before the conclusion of the war; and if, notwithstanding its vast resources, the Northern Government should be baffled, the contest may be indefinitely prolonged.

In propounding their policy as to the abolition of slavery, Mr. LINCOLN and Mr. SEWARD called the attention of the Commissioners to the amendment of the Constitution which has been approved by two-thirds of either House of Congress, and by the PRESIDENT himself. If the amendment is sanctioned by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, slavery will henceforth become unlawful wherever the Federal jurisdiction extends. The Government has, therefore, as far as possible, put concession on the question of slavery out of its own power; and it has superseded by more regular legislative action the PRESIDENT's proclamation. As any law or constitutional enactment will be valid only as far as the Federal authority extends, the Southern States are not at present concerned to dispute the regularity of the proceeding. Thus far, Congress appears not to have committed any usurpation, except in counting the votes of Senators and Representatives from some of the States which are claimed by the Confederacy. With the aid of members holding a doubtful qualification, exactly two-thirds of the House has concurred in the resolution of the Senate, and, as a majority forms a quorum, the House has in theory the right of binding the States which are voluntarily absent from Congress. But some difficulty may arise in procuring the assent of the necessary number of Legislatures. Mr. SUMNER, with his usual regard for fairness, proposed to accelerate a decision by only requiring the approval of three-fourths of the loyal States. Congress, however, held that formal exclu-

sion from the list of States was equivalent to recognition, and it has been resolved that, out of the whole number of thirty-six States, twenty-seven must adopt the amendment before it is embodied in the Constitution. It was calculated that if Western Virginia, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee were added to the Free States, the necessary plurality would be secured, but Delaware has unexpectedly rejected the amendment, and the votes of Kentucky and New Jersey are doubtful. Uninterrupted loyalty to the Union has exempted the little state of Delaware from political and military manipulation; but, in those Slave States which have been partially conquered, the Administration secures unanimity by the simple process of disfranchising all opponents. The recent Convention in Tennessee illustrated the propensity of a dominant faction to disregard the rights and wishes of an adverse minority. A Convention in Missouri has deliberately excluded from the suffrage, not only the citizens of the State who have served the Confederate Government, but every person who has at any time expressed a wish or a hope for the triumph of the Confederate arms. A Legislature chosen by such a constituency will of course concur in the amendment of the Constitution; but the theory of republican institutions will become complicated and perplexing if the majority is supreme in every part of the North, and the minority in every part of the South. Seven or eight years ago, the Missouri slave-owners practised much lawless interference with the rights of their neighbours in Kansas. Those of them who survive will learn a lesson from the equally reckless tyranny of the adversaries whom fortune has now brought to the top of the wheel.

The spring campaign is commencing both in Virginia and South Carolina, and General THOMAS is said to be traversing Alabama with a large force of cavalry and mounted infantry. The rumours of the evacuation of Mobile, though they are not yet confirmed, are intrinsically not improbable, as General TAYLOR, after detaching a portion of his army to the assistance of BEAUREGARD, may probably desire to concentrate his limited forces at some point in the interior. General TERRY, the captor of Fort Fisher, now the only civilian in high command, is supposed to be advancing on Wilmington with a large detachment from GRANT's main army. General SHERMAN still threatens Branchville, Augusta, and Charleston, and the Confederate generals are waiting for the development of his plans. General GRANT, after a skirmish in which he expended a considerable number of men, has succeeded in extending his left in the direction of the Danville railway. General LEE professes not to understand the reason of the movement, which may perhaps have been designed only to cover the advance on Wilmington. While the Federal Government is counting on the vote of the Legislature of Arkansas in favour of the amendment of the Constitution, it is stated that a large Confederate force is about to leave that State to reinforce TAYLOR in Mississippi. A similar movement has often been announced, but either the Federal gun-boats have hitherto prevented all attempts to cross the river in force, or the Western army has deliberately abandoned the left bank of the Mississippi to its fate.

FREE-AND-EASY ELECTIONEERING.

WHEN the young man of quality descends from the serious interests of fashionable life to the comparatively frivolous political duties of his position, he commonly finds it most convenient to take up the humorous line, and to discuss questions of State with airy jocularly. An awkward bachelor who is introduced to children invariably tries to make himself agreeable to them by a very forced hilarity, and the fashionable youth on whom unfortunate circumstances have inflicted the necessity of making himself agreeable to free and independent electors generally resorts to the same device. He does not understand enough of politics to discuss them seriously, and he is not sufficiently familiar with the nature of the strange creatures whom he is addressing to be quite at ease even in his jocosity. For he is uncomfortably conscious throughout the performance that some of his listeners are grimly in earnest about the points which he is handling with such graceful levity, and he is far too good-natured, as a rule, to like to hurt even an elector's feelings. The position must be embarrassing for both parties. The elector's constitutional reverence for blue blood prevents him from resenting the inopportune flippancy of the candidate. The candidate is in an equal strait between a desire to conciliate his audience and a desperate inability to enter into their feelings and opinions. The entire ceremonial with which a light-minded young candidate introduces himself and his little parcel of

shibboleths to a promiscuous audience is highly interesting to people who like to watch the working of the British Constitution. A more remarkable instance of what takes place on such solemn occasions could not be found than the proceedings, a few evenings ago, in connexion with the future representation of Westminster. Sir DE LACY EVANS has announced his intention of retiring when the dissolution comes, and the Honourable Mr. GROSVENOR offers himself as his successor. A meeting was held for the purpose of giving the candidate an opportunity of stating his opinions, and the electors an opportunity of cross-examining him upon them. The representation of Westminster was declared by one of the speakers to be the "blue ribbon" of the representation of the country, and no man can aspire to it who has not historic antecedents. This being the case, it is satisfactory to find that the candidate on the present occasion is not unknown in the chronicles of the time. He has been long and prominently before the eye of the intelligent public. Mr. GROSVENOR is a son of Lord EBURY, and was, we presume, one of those immortal little boys whom, according to their father's impassioned testimony, the service on Good Friday and Ash Wednesday invariably sent to sleep. To be a standing proof of the need of liturgical revision is a peculiar and original distinction which the electors of Westminster will be able to appreciate in their representative. The youthful slumbers of Mr. GROSVENOR entitle him to the gratitude of all the enemies of long services, and every Evangelical voter will feel bound to support a man whose early sleep has caused such an awakening in the Church. There would seem to be some reason for supposing that, in his riper years, Mr. GROSVENOR still suffers from the length, or some other objectionable quality, of the Church Service; for, in reply to a person who asked whether he would advocate the opening of the Museum on Sundays, he stated that he would have no objection to go himself to the Museum on Sundays, "and perhaps he should do better there than he sometimes did elsewhere." What this fearfully mysterious self-accusation means, to what awful backsliding so ROUSSEAU-like a confession has reference, is a secret locked in the depths of Mr. GROSVENOR's bosom. But if conjecture on so delicate and almost sacred a theme be not impertinent, one might suppose that these words of dark remorse point still to the sacrilegious nap. Perhaps, reflects Mr. GROSVENOR with an effort of unsparring introspection, he should do better in looking at pinned butterflies, and stuffed birds, and noseless statues, than in dozing in church. This is a point which may safely be left undecided, but the youthful candour which raised it is eminently attractive.

Mr. GROSVENOR began his oration by a brief but uncommonly warm panegyric on Sir DE LACY EVANS. Then he apologized for having had the Marble Arch disfigured by his placards, "to the prejudice of the Sydenham trousers and the adorable MENKEN." The allusion was immensely humorous, but not without peril. To make jokes about claptrap advertisements before an audience principally composed of tradesmen was dangerous, and the collocation of trousers with a female equestrian, whose chief attraction was popularly supposed to be the conspicuous absence of most articles of apparel, was almost indelicate. The speaker next apologized for venturing to stand for so important a city as Westminster, but, after enumerating his scruples with rather needless particularity, he once more became funny, and announced that "he had made them up into a neat little parcel, and directed them to the Post-office, Coventry, to be left till called for." The simple pungency of this surprising joke drew down shouts of laughter, which were renewed when Mr. GROSVENOR complained that there never was a time when "a man who wished to make a telling speech had greater difficulties to contend with," and therefore, "if his listeners expected him to be sincere, they must not expect him to be lively." A man who wishes to make a telling speech, but has no ideas out of which to make it, has indeed serious difficulties to contend with. The only pity is that he ever conceived the wish. Still the extraordinary gracefulness and classic elegance of his phrases compensated for Mr. GROSVENOR's temporary lack of ideas, and he was lively in spite of his warning. Whether his speech was telling or not, and whether, if so, it told exactly in the intended direction, are points more doubtful. Want of knowledge is readily made up for by force of language. For example, Mr. GROSVENOR confessed frankly that "he could not say whether we might be involved in any complications arising from the American struggle." It is as well that the electors of Westminster should know this at once. Their candidate is willing to let them have the best of himself, but prophecy is not at all in his line. However, he did not leave his audience in utter ignorance of his views on America, for he went on to say, in

language of mingled beauty and strength, that "if the patience of JOHN BULL was exhausted, and if under great provocation he should kick his cousin JONATHAN into the middle of next week, they might expect from the unprejudiced jury of Europe an unqualified verdict of 'Sarve him right.'" The exquisitely good taste of such a passage as this is as charming as anything in the records of political oratory. Mr. CHASE's graphically expressed desire to "give old mother England a good shaking" is feeble and vulgar beside Mr. GROSVENOR's picture of JOHN BULL "kicking his cousin JONATHAN into the middle of next week." But this is only natural. One of the chief advantages conferred by an aristocracy is that its members may serve as models of taste and culture, and if it were not for men like Mr. GROSVENOR, who consent to abandon luxurious ease in order to set an example to those beneath them, it is hard to say what pitch of vulgarity and slang the language might not reach. Another instance of easy humour in Mr. GROSVENOR's speech should not be passed over. No one could tell, he said, who might be the great man who was supposed to be coming forward for the representation of Westminster at the next general election. "But whether it was General GARIBALDI, or His Holiness the POPE, or Count BISMARCK, he did not much care; he was ready for the lot." The meeting is said to have been highly amused at this choice of jocoseness, and again rewarded the youthful performer with laughter and applause. He doubtless thought he was imitating the jaunty manner of the PREMIER, and winning the hearts of all listeners by combined pluck and hilarity. Probably, however, there were a few fastidious critics in the crowd who felt that, after all, it was very sorry fun to talk of GARIBALDI or the POPE becoming a candidate for Westminster, and that to declare himself "ready for the lot" was a piece of unbecoming slang on the candidate's part. But such critics should remember that, if a man has not got anything serious to say, he must of necessity fall back on jokes, and this was plainly Mr. GROSVENOR's plight.

Neither jokes nor arguments, however, were what the candidate really relied on. "He asked the electors to stand by one who, having lived among them all his days and being attached to liberal principles, was prepared, in the prime of life, to devote himself to their service." A good many of the listeners were, no doubt, considerably touched by the appeal to the domestic sentiments of those among whom he had lived all his days. Mr. GROSVENOR's notion of "the prime of life" would seem to be peculiar, for he had no sooner concluded his touching peroration than one JONES got up and said, "The young gentleman has not mentioned fire-insurance." The young gentleman in the prime of life replied that he would be very glad to see the duty taken off—a simple and straightforward expression of a valuable opinion which will have due weight with the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER. Then an elector got up and wished to know "if Captain GROSVENOR was real stern to do all he could against the Catholics, and whether he would do all he could to suppress Romanism and support Protestantism." This stroke the candidate parried by a declaration of his warm attachment to the Established Church. It is a comfort to think that, if Lord Ebury carries out his menace and leaves the Church, his son in the prime of life will still be devoted to her service, though that little matter as to what "he sometimes does elsewhere on Sundays" should be cleared up if possible. After the "real stern" Protestant had sat down, a Dissenter protested against "the hardship and intolerance of cemeteries being divided, sometimes by stakes, sometimes by hidden stakes sunk in a ditch." The candidate was rather perplexed by this, and did not even say that he should be glad to see the obnoxious stakes pulled up. However, his escape is only for a moment, for the Nonconformists are going to draw up a statement of their opinions, and the Dissenter told the young gentleman he would be better for "giving his due consideration to these things and pondering them in his heart." Then a working-man proposed a resolution to the effect that no candidate is worthy to represent Westminster who does not pledge himself to support manhood suffrage, and the resolution was seconded by a gentleman with the very inauspicious name of LENO. After Mr. LENO, a person got up to complain of "certain grievances suffered by persons who did not believe in the literal interpretation of certain passages in the Bible." What the grievances were, and what interpretation of the passages in question he did believe in, was never learnt, because the rest of the audience, being, as was repeated again and again during the evening, fervent and staunch disciples of civil and religious liberty, refused to give him a hearing. It was in reply to this person that Mr. GROSVENOR said he would not object, for his own part, to go to the Museum on Sundays, only "he did not like to do violence to the feelings

"of large numbers of persons." We should like to know what improvement was ever yet introduced into the world which did not do violence to the feelings of large numbers of persons. After this response, an elector, with more frankness than was consistent with regard for Mr. GROSVENOR's feelings, exclaimed that Westminster had long been dead in the councils of the nation, and would still be dead if they elected a man "whose chief recommendation was that he was the son of a lord." However, the meeting thought this recommendation sufficient, and a vote of confidence in Mr. GROSVENOR was triumphantly passed; and, whoever may oppose him, this particularly free-and-easy candidate is, in his own polished phrase, "ready for the lot." It must be confessed that the whole affair does very little to increase one's reverence, either for those who have "the blue ribbon" of representation at their disposal, or for the gentleman who aspires to it.

THE YELLOW BOOK.

THE French *Yellow Book* is an annual Encyclopædia of that kind of information which, in England, is distributed into innumerable Blue Books. The more cumbersome record of statistics and administrative details is the fuller of the two, and, as it contains the result of Parliamentary inquiries, it is more impartial and more critical, if not more authentic; but the *Yellow Book* is compendious and convenient, and the series forms a complete official history of every branch of government. The portion which relates to the foreign policy of the Empire is, on this occasion, meagre and uninteresting, for the transactions to which it relates are of secondary importance, and they are already familiarly known. The longest paragraph or section of the document is the emptiest of matter, as it merely expands the concise apology by which the EMPEROR, in his opening Speech, excused or justified his failure to influence the course of affairs in the quarrel between Germany and Denmark. The Foreign Minister dwells at great length on the anxiety of his Government to advocate the principle of nationality which would have been exemplified by the division of Schleswig between the belligerents. As, however, France also "conscientiously supported the Treaty of 1852," it was difficult to combine the modern theory with the existing compact. The EMPEROR's Government further objected to disposing of the Duchies without regard to the wish of the population, but the people of Schleswig and Holstein had never been consulted when the PRINCE PRESIDENT hastened to sign the treaty by which the provinces were to be annexed in perpetuity to the Danish Crown. The doctrines of nationality and of popular choice are severally plausible, but it is not always easy to reconcile them in practice. A province which, like Alsace, speaks German, may be cordially attached to France; and the Channel Islanders, who talk Norman-French, have for many centuries maintained their loyalty to an English Government. As every great Power in Europe rules over alien subjects, it is inexpedient to place considerations of language or of race on the level of positive public law. A Government which makes nationality an excuse for annexation seldom applies the rule to its own disadvantage, and it is impossible to foresee the operation of the principle until the political unit which is to be dealt with has been ascertained. The majority of the people of Schleswig was probably inclined to the rule of Germany, but the majority in North Schleswig was indisputably Danish. When the Germans of the province found themselves on the winning side, they were seized with a patriotic objection to the division of the common country; and accordingly, a considerable Danish district is now severed from Denmark, as five years ago the Italian county of Nice was severed from Italy. The sacred right to natural boundaries is sometimes found even more indefeasible than the sacred right of nationality. The whole discussion in the *Yellow Book* is spun out for the apparent purpose of discouraging critical readers, nor is the question of any practical importance. The real object of the official apologist is to prove that, when French diplomacy was worsted, the influence of the Imperial Government was not seriously exerted.

Frenchmen will have been more deeply interested in the defence of the Italian Convention, but they will derive little new information from the authoritative account of the proceeding. It is courteously asserted that the proposal to remove the capital from Turin to Florence originated with the Italian Government, but no explanation is given of the previous overtures which must certainly have preceded the concession. It seems that the change afforded irrefragable testimony of the sincerity of the supposed intention of

abandoning the hope of making Rome the capital of the monarchy. But, as no Italian statesman has ever avowed the purpose which is eagerly accepted as satisfactory, some doubt attaches to the assertion that "it is not a question, as some ardent minds have supposed, of a simple station towards another capital, of an expedient solely intended to clear the way to Rome for the partisans of absolute unity." The Italians wisely say that they go to Florence, and that they reserve for a future occasion the question whether they are to go further. Non-diplomatic sagacity fails to discover the reasons which would render a migration from Florence more impracticable than if it were commenced from Turin. Italy has, indeed, engaged not to attack Rome, but the presence of the French garrison constituted an equally binding engagement. The King of ITALY has not undertaken to protect the Papal Government except from foreign enemies, and the POPE may be excused if he fails to appreciate the contingent aid of the enemy whom he inveterately detests. The Emperor NAPOLEON is perfectly aware that, while the Italians repudiate his interpretation of the Convention, the POPE and the clerical party regard it as the abandonment of the Roman cause. It is sufficient for his purpose to explain that he has taken all verbal and formal precautions; and his subjects must admit that, under present circumstances, Rome would be as effectually protected by a French veto as by a French army. For the rest, opinions may be modified and circumstances may change, and "the eventualities of the future belong wholly to Providence."

The passages of the Report which relate to Turkey strikingly illustrate the busy activity of France in the East. The claim to a Protectorate of the Catholics of the Levant is still more unexpectedly implied in a paragraph on the annexation of the Ionian Islands to the Kingdom of Greece. Although the formal assent of the Great Powers was necessary before the transfer could be effected, it had not been generally known that the concurrence of France had been accompanied by any condition. Austria, supposing her own security to be affected, required the demolition of the fortifications of Corfu, but it was not apparent that France had any interest in the transaction, except as far as it countenanced the favourite theory of nationality. It now appears that the Imperial Government has provided certain undefined guarantees for the Catholic clergy of the Ionian Islands. Orthodox Princes, as well as infidel Turks, if they are not strong enough to exclude foreign interference, must submit to the pious solicitude of France for the spiritual subjects of the POPE. In the Danubian provinces, the ecclesiastical sympathies of the EMPEROR have been modified by a regard to temporal expediency. Prince COUZA has, through French influence, been enabled to complete his confiscation of the property of the monasteries, and perhaps the measure was thought the more tolerable because the majority of the convents belonged to the Eastern communion. It was a singular circumstance that the defence of the religious foundations was unsuccessfully conducted by the Sublime Porte, with the occasional support of Protestant England. The friendly offices of France have also been employed in reconciling the SULTAN and his allies to a political operation by which Prince COUZA exchanged a nominally constitutional system for an absolute monarchy based on universal suffrage. As the plot and the revolution conformed with the utmost strictness to the approved Parisian model, it would have been unreasonable to withhold the countenance of France, especially as the whole arrangement had been organized by the French Consul-General in obedience to orders from home. Experience will show whether a province detached from Turkey can, on the frontier of Russia, be permanently retained as a French dependency. The inhabitants of the Principalities were freer and more secure from oppression under the old system of feudal dependence upon Turkey; but it is not improbable that the prevalence of French influence may promote the spread of Western civilization, and the development of the material resources of the country. The Turkish Government has also been forced to submit to French interference in other parts of its dominions. The obstacles to the prosecution of the Suez Canal which had been interposed by the PORTE have been removed or modified by negotiation. Additional measures have been taken for the protection of the Maronites, and some changes have been made in the administration of Lebanon. It may perhaps be satisfactory to the SULTAN, and to his vassal at Tunis, to be informed that France seeks no exclusive influence in the Ottoman Principalities, though the disclaimer is qualified by the statement that Tunis must not become an arena for foreign rivalries and competitions. A petty potentate compelled to receive the advice and warnings of an irresistible neighbour,

and strictly prohibited from admitting foreign rivalry into his councils, may perhaps fail to appreciate his own exemption from exclusive influence.

If the American rumour of the sequestration of Sonora, as security for the French demands, has the smallest foundation, the secrets of the Imperial Government must be closely kept. The official notice of the war is almost confined to the expression of regret that certain claims of French subjects have not been more readily satisfied by the Federal Government. The profession of continued neutrality would not be literally incompatible with a purpose of recognising the South; but if the EMPEROR had determined to change his policy, he would probably have given some intimation of his decision. The Emperor MAXIMILIAN is congratulated on the definitive establishment of his Empire, and on the consequent termination of Mexican anarchy. It is hoped that, with the help of time, "the reign of the Emperor MAXIMILIAN will achieve the liquidation of a deplorable past." The French troops are returning to France by detachments, and it is asserted that all regular war is over, although brigandage is still pursued under shelter of the flag of the former Government. It would have been undignified to refer directly to the vote by which the Federal House of Representatives affected still exclusively to recognise the Republic. American Consuls accredited to the extinct Government will not be received in any considerable Mexican town. If, indeed, the late peace negotiations had proved successful, JUAREZ would probably have been provided with means for continuing or renewing the struggle; but, as long as the Confederacy is interposed, the United States must acquiesce in the actual condition of Mexico. Armed interference would, during the continuance of the civil war, be wildly imprudent.

THE DEFENCE OF CANADA.

THERE was probably a certain amount of rhetorical affectation in the blame which some of the speakers in the debate on Canada cast upon the Government for publishing Colonel JERVOIS' Report. The peril to which attention has thus been drawn is not likely to be aggravated by making known the precautions which an able engineer officer considers essential, and, in a sense, sufficient for the emergency; and it is a great point to have elicited from the leaders of both parties the declaration that England is bound in interest and honour to cooperate with any effectual measures which may be taken in the colony for its own defence. The weakest points on a frontier which is weak from one end to the other are well enough known to the Northern Americans, who have been long prepared for the contingency of an invasion of Canada, as the one card which they have to play if any of their intemperate provocations should at length force this country into war. Formidable as the task of defending Canada against her powerful neighbour must always be, and desperate as it would be unless the colonists were moved to exertions from which they have hitherto shrunk, the Report of Colonel JERVOIS is not altogether a disheartening document. It is quite true that Canada has a frontier of enormous extent, which no defensive organization could make absolutely safe against an enemy disposing of superior force. But the vital points are not numerous, and are quite capable of being made tenable by a comparatively moderate force until the strength of the Province could be fully developed, and the whole weight of the power of England brought to bear on the seaboard as well as on the land frontier of the enemy. To protect Canada, in the sense of making her secure against the devastation of war, is impossible until the people shall turn out as one man, prepared to maintain their independence with the same resolution which the Confederates have shown in the attempt to establish theirs. The old spirit of the Canadian people, the marked growth of loyal feeling among them, and the stimulus of their new national organization, afford guarantees enough of a sturdy resistance when once they find themselves irrevocably engaged in the struggle, and the real difficulty is to devise measures for keeping an invader at bay until the needful time has been won for efficient military organization. The problem is to save the country from being conquered almost before it has had time to realize the fact that it is at war. To achieve even this will require vastly more sacrifice than the colonists have yet thought it incumbent on them to endure; but a militia force such as could be raised without any difficulty would, in Colonel JERVOIS' opinion, amply suffice, with the aid of a small British contingent, to hold the strategic points essential to the defence, not only of Lower, but of Upper Canada. The lower province, from its proximity to England and its geographical situation, is of

course, in a military sense, by far the most important; and as long as Quebec and Montreal held out, this portion of the country could never be subjugated. If, in addition to this, a naval preponderance were established on the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, a large part of both provinces would be safe from molestation. For this end two things are essential—one, that Quebec and Montreal should be covered by fortifications suitable to the conditions of modern warfare, and Kingston, Toronto, and Hamilton adequately protected against a hostile descent from the lake; the other, that a sufficient force should be available at the first outbreak of war to hold, at any rate, the two most important posts until reduced by a regular siege. No preparation short of an army capable of taking the field on equal terms against the enemy would make the district which lies between Lake Erie and Lake Huron absolutely secure from insult; but the Power which held Ontario and the St. Lawrence must ultimately remain master of the whole country.

These being the known conditions on which the national existence of the Canadians would depend in the event of war, it might have been thought incredible that they should hitherto have been utterly neglected. Quebec has no fortifications which would be of any avail against modern artillery, and Montreal is wholly without defence. Kingston, the importance of which as commanding the mouth of the Rideau Canal is very considerable, might be made a strong position by some additions to its defensive works, but at present it has no adequate fortifications. As for the other Lake towns, they are absolutely at the mercy of an enemy who might gain a temporary naval superiority. Even if all the material resources of defence were supplied, they would be useless until the small contingent of British troops was supported by a force such as Canada has not yet attempted to raise. Some 10,000 English soldiers and 21,000 Canadian Volunteers, who may perhaps be nearly on a level in training with average Volunteer regiments at home, constitute the whole force of which the Commander-in-Chief in Canada would have to dispose. Even if the requisite fortifications existed, such a force would be useless in opposition to the enormous armies with which an invasion would in all likelihood be attempted, while up to this time nothing has been done to put the vital points of the country in a creditable state of defence. After such a display of apathy in the fourth year of the American war, it was indeed time that the truth should be openly told both to England and to Canada, as it has been told in Colonel Jervois' able Report. The history of the relations between Canada and the Home Government during these years of peril would have been ludicrous if the issue at stake had been less momentous. On both sides the impending danger was seen, and in terms admitted; but Canada persistently refused to do anything for her own protection, lest she should diminish the contingent expected from England in the event of war, while the Home Government, disgusted with the indifference of the colonists, was preparing to withdraw the troops from the outlying posts, where their presence was all-important for the purpose of training the native recruits who might at last be brought into the field. This fatal, though, in certain contingencies, inevitable policy seems for the moment to have been averted by the remonstrances of Colonel Jervois against the abandonment of the Toronto station, and by the indications at length apparent on the part of the Colonial statesmen of a better appreciation of the dangers that surround them, and of the responsibilities which fall upon their country. As yet the Canadian Militia exists only upon paper, but a few hundred officers have been trained in the military schools established at the head-quarters of the British regiments, and the first contingent, composed exclusively of young unmarried men, is said to be on the point of being called out for service. This alone will furnish nearly 90,000 rank and file, while the total strength of the force, including the reserve, is calculated at 470,000 men. If these promises are promptly kept, the aspect of the whole question will be entirely changed. When the Canadians no longer grudge the expense absolutely essential to their own safety, they will find no reluctance on the part of England to do her part in the common cause. As a nucleus, round which the national forces may organize themselves, the British force will be invaluable, but more than this it can never be. If we were to leave our own island to the sole protection of the Volunteers, our army would still be altogether inadequate to the defence of the colonial frontier. Canada, as Lord ELLENBOROUGH said, must be defended by the Canadians, and the hearty acceptance on their part of this first duty of every free country will ensure them an amount of effective assistance from the Mother-country which neither would, nor indeed could, be given on any other

terms. Already the Home Government has consented, on the implied condition of effective co-operation, to bear its part of the expenses of the necessary fortifications; and the naval defence of the Ontario seaboard will of necessity, in the first instance, fall exclusively upon the English navy.

The serious part of the affair is the time which has already been lost. At the rate at which it is proposed to construct the works, the fortifications of Quebec will not be finished in less than four years; while the Montreal entrenchments, which are undertaken by the colonists, will be twice as costly, and perhaps twice as tedious. The usual official explanation, that it is impossible to proceed more rapidly with a due regard to the solidity and permanence of the work, will satisfy no one. The danger to be averted is as likely to occur in a few months as in a few years, and entrenchments and fortifications thrown up rapidly enough to be ready when wanted would be more to the purpose, even if they should be incapable of standing for a thousand years. Neither in the proposal of the Ministers to spend 50,000*l.* a year on the fortifications of Quebec, nor in the movements of the Canadian Executive, can we trace any adequate appreciation of the dangers which Colonel JERVOIS' Report enforces. Every day that Canada remains in her present defenceless state adds incalculably to the risk of war, and if the calamity is either to be staved off, or, should that be impossible, to be effectually met, something more like the energy with which the Confederates prepared for their terrible struggle must be manifested both in the Colonial Office and in the Canadian Executive. During the *Trent* dispute the Canadians never brought themselves to believe in the possibility of war, and though their eyes are now perhaps a little opened, they have not thoroughly shaken off the delusion, so common in all countries after a long term of peace, that all will go well without any special exertion to secure the blessings which they have enjoyed. The alacrity with which the Volunteers responded to the recent call of the Governor-General is some evidence that the singular apathy of the last few years is not due to any lack of military ardour. The cost of maintaining an active force is much more alarming to the colonists than the prospect of fighting; and both the non-existence of the Militia and the smallness of the Volunteer force at the present time are to be accounted for by the reluctance of successive Ministries to impose pecuniary burdens which, in a comparatively poor country like Canada, wholly unaccustomed to military expenses, are much more unpopular than they would be here.

There is ground for hoping that the new Federation will take a higher view of its obligations than any of the constituent colonies have been in the habit of doing, but the work to be done is too urgent to await the political regeneration of the country. It would be better to give up the idea of defence altogether than to organize an army which should be ready to enter unfinished fortifications after the whole country had fallen into an enemy's hands. Promptitude is now the one virtue by which past neglect can be atoned for, and we hope no countenance will be given to delay by restricting the immediate English contribution to the works (as has been proposed) to one-fourth only of the sum required. If entrenchments are to be of any use at all, it is surely better to spend 200,000*l.* in completing them at once than to throw away 50,000*l.* upon works which would be of no service but to invite attack.

MORAL INSANITY.

THE suicide of the murderer GEORGE VICTOR TOWNLEY has recalled public attention, not only to the history of his crime, but to the strength or weakness of the views held by certain medical authorities on what is now called "Moral Insanity." It is, we believe, argued that the tragic end of this criminal confirms the judgment of those experts on whose opinions the Derby justices acted in giving a certificate of his insanity. We are told that the sequel of the case proves the thorough consistency of TOWNLEY's mental history. He committed an outrageous murder because he was devoid of all moral sense and recognised no moral responsibility. He utterly disbelieved in a future state of rewards and punishments, and he finally dealt with his own life much as he had dealt with his sweetheart's life. It was a trifle which he might retain or fling away under no sense of duty to himself, to society, or to his Maker. This, as we are told, or shall be told, is a consistent life. It is ruled by madness throughout. Beginning with murder, it logically concludes with suicide. No moral convictions, no sense of responsibility—this is madness. We certainly agree with this estimate of the case so far as to be convinced that TOWNLEY's career is

thoroughly consistent with itself. We should expect that such a character would end in self-murder. A man who murders his neighbour is very likely indeed to murder himself. One JUDAS ISCARIOT ran through precisely the same moral course; and it is quite possible that, under the psychological manipulation of medical authorities, he also would have been found to be morally insane. For all practical purposes, he too committed murder—murder of the basest and most irrational kind—and ended in suicide. The conclusion, therefore, must be that M. RENAN's distinguished client was, like TOWNLEY, "morally insane," and therefore irresponsible.

We have no objection theoretically to all this talk. It is a mere question of words, and saves the trouble of thought. If experts choose to say that all very great criminals and scoundrels of extravagant wickedness are *ipso facto* morally insane, because their vices and atrocious deeds exceed the ordinary dimensions of everyday sin, we have no particular objection to their saying so. All that comes of it is to deprive the word "insanity" of any real meaning. When, however, we come to a practical conclusion, we are at issue with the ingenious practitioners who hold this doctrine of moral insanity. We would hang the victim of moral insanity; they would not. We should not seriously complain if BORGIA, or CATILINE, or NERO—the last of whom likewise consummated every vice and crime by a blundering attempt at suicide—were called morally insane. The phrase appears to be only used as convertible with intensely wicked; and if, contrary to the custom of ordinary speech, "insane" only means very wicked, anybody may in this way misuse language as much as he pleases, for aught we care. This is the fallacy that requires to be exposed. Insanity, as hitherto used by articulately speaking men, is inconsistent with responsibility; but, in the gabble of medical science, irresponsibility is proved by the mere fact of extraordinary immorality. If this is to be so, it will certainly simplify the criminal code. It only requires a new chart and scale of wickedness. Henceforth, the greater the knave, the less his guilt. A moderate criminal, who has only reached to the point of the moral thermometer registered temperate, is not insane, and may therefore be punished. Let his crime rise a few degrees in intensity, and he becomes irresponsible. If his moral perceptions are merely hazy and indistinct, we may fine, flog, and imprison him; but when, by a long course of indulgence in vice, and after a sustained absence of all checks and restraints on his passions, he has contrived to obliterate all moral perceptions, and is thoroughly brutalized, he is an interesting victim of obscure mental disease, whom it would be as unjust to punish for the consequences of the state of his brain as it would be to institute a criminal prosecution against a victim of rheumatic fever. We shall, of course, be told that this way of putting it is very unscientific, and that, unless we have made psychological analysis a matter of profound study, we have no right to express ourselves in this coarse and crude manner. Casual observers are not fair or adequate judges of what does or does not constitute lunacy. It is only an expert who is possessed of the mysterious solvent by which the subtle elements of insanity disengage themselves, and are revealed to the acute professional sense. There is this amount of truth in such language, that experience does, of course, give professional men superior skill in forcing real lunatics to expose their delusions. But in cases such as that of TOWNLEY nothing of the sort occurs. The expert has no advantage over the ordinary observer. All that the most acute observer, after the most diligent probing, could extract from him was that he was totally deficient in the sense of moral responsibility; but this fact was equally patent to the most unscientific observer. It wanted no M.D. to bring out the fact; the only question is as to the practical value of the fact. The difference is, that the medical authorities assume that the absence of the sense of responsibility on the patient's—or, as we should say, criminal's—part towards society, implies the abeyance of responsibility on the part of society towards the criminal. It means that, when once a man says "I have 'no duties,' therefore he has none. It means that it is enough for a scoundrel to deny that he recognises law, for law to retire from the dispute and decline the jurisdiction which is thus impudently contested. And when we are told that TOWNLEY's was an obscure case, that his disease was very subtle, and required the most refined and delicate diagnosis to detect it, the answer is that there was never anything plainer. TOWNLEY avowed throughout his moral, or immoral, code with the most patent and honest frankness:—"I am not responsible for my actions; and, therefore, I do 'what I please or what I must.'" To say this, we are told, is insanity; to say this, we reply, is most insolent wickedness, and if you act upon it we mean to hang you.

We do not suppose that the scientific advocates of TOWNLEY's original insanity really think their view strengthened by the proceedings at the Coroner's inquest. To bring in a verdict of unsound mind in a case of suicide is a matter of course, and in this particular case the jury acted under pressure throughout. The Coroner, Dr. LANKESTER, is obviously a disciple of the school whose views we have been combating; and this is an objection to the office being held by a professional person. Such a person has usually foregone and private views to support. The surgeon of the gaol had no reason to pronounce on TOWNLEY's insanity. One test of insanity was certainly wanting, for the size of the brain he pronounced to be normal; but he was immediately informed by the Coroner that organic disease of the brain is no proof of insanity. Insane persons often have no disease of the brain, and disease of the brain is often present in sane persons. Dr. LANKESTER, therefore, discards all the physical and material tests of insanity; what he looks for is "seeds of insanity," invisible tokens and inscrutable vague suspicions which are incapable of proof; he detects insanity by private and mysterious tests only known to the adepts, but quite perceptible to them even in cases "in which there are no 'appearances of insanity.'" To be sure Mr. BRADLEY could find none in this case, though he was naturally on the lookout for them. The Chaplain, however, was more malleable. The jury had been warned by the Coroner to dismiss from their minds all the history of TOWNLEY's case; but no such warning was addressed to the Chaplain. He therefore at once confines himself to the previous history of the deceased, and finding nothing of madness either in the past or present, as far as it was open to him, he argues backwards from TOWNLEY's death to his life. Certainly, from all that he had observed of TOWNLEY for twelve months, he should have considered him a sane man. But the suicide leads him to a different conclusion. TOWNLEY "was perfectly insensible to the sin of the act which he committed. He could not see that it was 'sin. He was morally insane.'" And, as a further evidence of TOWNLEY's insanity, the reverend gentleman adverted to the letter written by the murderer to his mother—a letter which, to the minds of those who do not believe in "moral insanity," is only a tedious farrago of coarse, heartless, and unfeeling nonsense, and plainly betrays, what there is no question of, that the writer acknowledged no moral obligations to God or man.

And here we may take leave of VICTOR TOWNLEY. His whole case has seriously compromised the administration of the law. But the evil has been at least partially retrieved. The mistake under which a certificate of his insanity was originally procured cannot be repeated, for an Act of Parliament has prevented its recurrence. The criminal lunatic was, to the credit of medical science—after an investigation which reversed the opinion of the experts who prevailed at Derby—transformed into a felon; and, though TOWNLEY escaped the consequences of his crime, he died a convicted murderer. This is something. It is not the first case in which, having been jockeyed into a miscarriage of justice, the Home Office declined to carry out the righteous decision of the law, and, by an inconsistency perhaps in some degree pardonable, refused to hang as vile a murderer as ever lived, only because the immediate execution of his sentence had been prevented by a series of successful intrigues. But VICTOR TOWNLEY's fate is hardly encouraging to the scientific gentlemen who preach the doctrine of moral insanity. Penal servitude for life, though alleviated by the perusal of *Gil Blas*, *Silvio Pellico*, and an opportunity of practising in German calligraphy, was found to be a punishment so intolerable that TOWNLEY preferred suicide to his experiences of Pentonville and his prospects of Portland. This life-history will scarcely encourage amateur atheists—even though, like TOWNLEY, they may be enabled to quote the traditional records of family insanity in the case of their great-grandmother's aunt's second cousin twice-removed—to murder their sweethearts and themselves. Fanatics may, if they please, still continue to console themselves with the private opinion that disbelief in God and in a future state of rewards and punishments is a sufficient proof of lunacy, even though this doctrine would have consigned AUGUSTE COMTE to a hospital. And fools who are puzzled by the presence and language of an audacious criminal towering above ordinary villany, may take refuge in the plea of moral insanity, careless or ignorant that the excuse might equally have availed for PALMER and RUSH. But at present the law of England has not been changed since it was laid down in M'NAGHTEN's case; and the opinions of fools and fanatics on the subject will not, we are persuaded, be fruitful in any practical results on the guardians and makers of the law. It has never been proved, because it never can be proved, that

"moral insanity" is more than a mischievous juggle of words; and the world's common sense, and the necessities of social security, are likely to protect us against any inconvenient consequences arising from the theoretical admission of an ideal possibility. Experts are free to hold what opinions they think proper, so long as we decline to allow to the "morally insane" freedom to commit unpunished murder, rape, or robbery.

THE GREEK PROFESSORSHIP.

THE question whether the Professor of Greek at Oxford should or should not be deprived of a fair day's wages for a very hard day's work, on account of alleged heresy, has been settled by a compromise more satisfactory than any one had a right to expect. The gross absurdity of underpaying a good Greek scholar because he is a bad theologian will no longer remain as a reproach to the seat of learning where a good half of our ruling class is educated. At the same time the result has been obtained without leaving upon the minds of an honest, though foolish, sect of fanatics the soreness of theological defeat. If Professor JOWETT had obtained his five hundred a year from the University chest, many a country clergyman would have laid his head upon his pillow that night, heavy at heart with the reflection that eternal punishment was in danger. No such sorrow will afflict him now; and he will be able to preach next Sunday upon his favourite doctrine, without any misgiving as to the consolations it affords. For there is a difference in this respect between a University and a College, which deserves to be noted for the benefit of the future historian. If a University pays a heretic Grecian, it is encouraging heresy; but if a College pays him, it is only encouraging Greek. The distinction may be hard for the unlearned to understand; but as it is undoubtedly there, and appears to be deeply rooted in the minds of a certain portion of the parochial clergy, it is evidently advantageous for the peace of the Church, and of society in general, that the endowment should be undertaken by a College, and not by a University.

It cannot be doubted that many who voted on recent occasions did so from motives which, though they derived all their force from the heat of party conflict, were yet in themselves defensible. There is a good deal to be said generally against increasing the amount of educational patronage which is nominally held by the Crown, but of course dispensed by the Minister, who is responsible for his selection to the House of Commons. Most people who have watched the workings of Ministerial responsibility in connexion with patronage are aware that, except for appointments of the first importance, it is one of the pleasantest fictions known to our Constitution. Some of the good things in the gift of the Crown, such as Bishoprics, and Ambassadorships, and Judgeships, affect the well-being of too many people to be jobbed comfortably. It would be too much to assert, with cases before our eyes like the Embassy of Turin, or the Bishoprics of Lord PALMERSTON's first Administration, that such offices are never disposed of without regard to merit. But in such cases a Minister must have a strong motive for jobbery—he must have a very near relation to promote—before he will face the amount of public obloquy which he will certainly incur. In appointments of minor importance, however, this check is almost wholly absent. It has been shown, by an experience sufficiently recent, that a Minister may provide for any number of dandies about town, by putting them into appointments which were intended for hardworking lawyers, without exciting any notice. It is reasonable to suppose that educational appointments will be liable, in similar hands, to similar abuse. But this would not be the greatest evil of the introduction of Crown patronage upon too large a scale into the disposal of University appointments. There is a wide-spread and not unnatural impression that, in some cases, appointments of this kind have not been disposed of by the Minister, but by other advisers of the Crown of a less constitutional character. There are certainly no appointments upon which an irregular influence could be brought to bear so easily, or with so little fear of detection. The power of a foreigner, upon whom his position may have conferred a predominant influence at the English Court, would be sufficient to enable him to dispose of such appointments according to his discretion; and, if he were a man strongly possessed with foreign notions of education, the temptation to make use of his power for the purpose of carrying them out would be irresistible. The danger of such a misuse is, at all events, sufficient to furnish a fair excuse for the fears of those who dread to see the Crown in possession of too strong an influence over the conduct of English education. But the portion of the Oxford majority who took this ground have overreached

themselves by an alliance with the fanatical party. If they had been willing to come to terms, and remove the pressing scandal, it might have been possible to impose restrictions upon the Crown's influence in the appointment. As it is, an arrangement has been made which alters, indeed, the source from which the stipend of the office is to be drawn, but leaves the Crown's patronage intact.

It is to be hoped that, now that the heat and the turmoil of the conflict are over, the gentlemen who conceived the bright idea of raising a theological war-cry upon a wretched question of salary are satisfied with what they have done. It is to be presumed that they had some object; but there is scarcely any object that it is possible to impute to them which must not now present to them a humiliating retrospect. It is hardly conceivable that they can have wished simply to deprive the Professor of his money; but, if so, they have failed. If they sought to drive him from his chair, they have failed. If they desired to lessen his influence, they have met with the sort of success which the shallowest knowledge of human nature would have enabled them to predict. They have succeeded in making his works known to thousands who had never thought of him; the sympathy which the young always give to the oppressed has been awakened in the breasts of large numbers on behalf of one who, before this petty persecution was commenced, possessed influence only with a small circle of personal friends. If they looked for the establishment of the dogmas which they imagined to be imperilled, it is to be feared that they have failed more lamentably still. Unless rumour is greatly at fault, there has never been a time when negative opinions have taken so extreme a form at Oxford as they have recently. The actual conflict, with all its scandal, has passed away, but it has left behind it powerful schools of thought which will not be easily extirpated, and seeds of future division which will bear some fruit at no distant date. The authors of this evil are probably indifferent to the damage they have caused, and will reply that they have been acting upon principle, and that they have liberated their consciences. There are few things more dangerous to the cause of religion and morality than a man of principle engaged in liberating his conscience. If one may judge from what is thrown off in the course of these self-emancipating efforts, it must be chiefly a large accumulation of silliness from which the conscience requires to be relieved. Liberating your conscience is a great phrase; but it usually means, when translated into the vernacular, letting off your bile. Most people pass through junctures of their lives when they feel an irresistible impulse to perform this operation. The only difference is in the manner of doing it. The ordinary worldling relieves the fulness of his heart by imprecating, while the man of principle liberates his conscience. But the point of honour to which the man of principle is bound is to insist upon his favourite dogma, whatever it may be, at the time when it is most inconvenient, before the people to whom it is the least likely to do good, and in connexion with matters with which it has not, in reality, the remotest concern.

It is to be hoped that we have nearly arrived at the conclusion of that period of small persecutions which has lately diversified the history of the English Church. During this period the Church has probably lost ground, in the affections and the belief of the more educated classes, which the quiet and patient well-doing of many long years will with difficulty restore. The clergy have been supplying to unbelief the only element of success which was lacking to it. So long as temper is kept, and times are quiet, and there is no provocation on the other side, negative theology has no power to stir its votaries to proselytism, and dies out languidly with the minds in which it arose. Nothing can give to it the energy necessary to make it aggressive but indignation against supposed attempts at oppression. It lay with the clergy to kill the natural scepticism of an age of reaction either by calm argument or by judicious neglect. They have preferred, by passionate attack, to goad it into a vigorous life, which it will not be easy to take away.

THE WEST AFRICAN SETTLEMENTS.

NO opposition was offered to Mr. ADDERLEY's motion for a Select Committee on the subject of the West Coast of Africa. The inquiry was naturally suggested by the discovery, during the last Session, that many valuable lives had been sacrificed in an unintelligible war between the Governor of Cape Coast Castle and the King of ASHANTEE. It is a principal inconvenience of military operations on the Gold Coast that it is quite unnecessary for the enemy to show himself, as his objects are more cheaply and effectually attained by the aid

of the climate. The English troops had never seen an Ashantee during their campaign, but they suffered heavy losses, and it was found that negro troops from the West Indies were even more unfit for the service than Europeans. No satisfactory explanation was given of the causes of this particular war; but, from the time when Greek colonies studded the coasts of the Mediterranean and Euxine, civilized settlers have always been engaged in conflicts with indigenous barbarians. It is probable that the King of ASHANTEE deserved exemplary chastisement, but unluckily it was expensive, if not impossible, to administer the punishment. A Colonial Governor naturally and properly attaches serious importance to the local interests and squabbles of the territories which he rules, but in the serene regions of Westminster and Downing Street the politics of Western Africa are contemplated without exaggeration. Mr. CARDWELL has none of the attributes of a bloodthirsty conqueror, and, in conformity with the general opinion of the House of Commons, he issued peremptory orders that the war, whether it was just and necessary or not, should be summarily stopped. Mr. ADDERLEY reasonably thought that the same causes which had occasioned the Ashantee war were likely hereafter to produce similar effects, and he has consequently moved for a Select Committee, in a speech which proves that his own opinion is distinctly hostile to the maintenance of the West African establishments. He considers that the settlements have failed commercially, because the trade in palm oil flourishes best on the unoccupied portions of the coast. He is not disposed to incur any considerable expense for the discouragement which is inflicted on the Slave Trade; and he objects to the anomalous position of a Governor who administers an indefinite code amongst half-independent savages. If Mr. ADDERLEY is Chairman of the Committee, he will probably propose the abandonment of all but a few posts in Western Africa, but there is little probability that Parliament will adopt the recommendation.

Of the four colonies of Cape Coast Castle, Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Lagos, two boast the respectable antiquity of two centuries and a half. The earlier settlements were used to promote the Slave Trade, as they are now retained principally for an opposite purpose. The inconsistency or variation is only in the objects to be attained, for it is probable that the occupation of a convenient slave market would facilitate equally the furtherance or the prevention of that branch of commerce. The English Government has not been anxious to preserve a troublesome possession, for, after one or two wars with Ashantee, the Gold Coast was handed over forty years ago to a trading company. In 1843, after a Parliamentary inquiry, the Crown resumed possession, and it is said that the Slave Trade has since been almost entirely suppressed along the English portion of the coast. Mr. CARDWELL apparently inclines to the opinion that all the four colonies might be more advantageously placed under a single Government; but the experiment has been tried without considerable advantage, and the present arrangement was recommended by the Committee of 1842, which included Lord RUSSELL and Lord DERBY. The Committee which is about to examine the subject will probably defer to the judgment of the Colonial Office, especially as Mr. CARDWELL has employed a competent agent to visit the African coast for the purpose of reporting on the condition and government of the colonies. It is supposed that certain reductions may be effected in the cost of administration, and the whole expense is inconsiderable. If the settlements are of any use, they are probably worth their cost, and if Western Africa were abandoned, it would be occupied by France, with the indirect result of reopening the Slave Trade. It is not perhaps the duty of the English Government to expend money and life for the encouragement of missionary enterprise, but it is difficult to believe, with the Basle Missionary Society, that the English establishments impede the work of conversion. It is not improbable that some jealousy may prevail among preachers of different sects and languages, and that Swiss philanthropists may innocently think that Christianity would be most advantageously taught in French or German. The whole result of religious propaganda in Western Africa is, however, so trifling, that it is hardly worth while for missionaries to quarrel among themselves. According to Captain BURTON, the Mussulmans of the North are the only successful proselytizers in Africa; but the negroes of Sierra Leone are nominally Christians.

Although the policy of maintaining the blockade against the Slave Trade was not ostensibly under discussion, it was impossible that the subject should be entirely excluded from the debate. Several speakers intimated their concurrence in the King of DAHOMEY's forcible remark that, if there were no buyers of slaves, no slaves would be sold. During

the inquiry of 1842, there was still a demand for African negroes in Brazil as well as in Cuba, and, notwithstanding the American law against slave-trading, cargoes were occasionally run into the rivers of the Southern States. Mr. LINCOLN has the credit and satisfaction of having hanged the first slave-trader who ever suffered the penalty of his crime in the United States, and there is no longer any danger that the traffic will be either legally or irregularly reopened. A vigorous policy, which trenches on the boundaries of international law, has convinced the Brazilians that it is cheaper and safer to rear their own slaves than to smuggle them through the blockading squadron. Cuba alone, with the connivance of the Spanish Government, perseveres in defying positive treaties and the opinion of the civilized world. An enthusiastic lady, in an Essay which was intended to celebrate the progress of emancipation in the Southern States, exultingly remarked that by the laws of Cuba every imported negro became free as soon as he landed. The captain of the slave-vessel which, according to Mr. CARDWELL, is now waiting at Whydah for a chance of evading the vigilance of the English cruisers is probably not aware that, even if he succeeds in his venture, his cargo will be valuable only as an illustration of the laws and of the beneficent practice of Cuba. It must be confessed that the Spaniards, both in Europe and in the colony, presume upon the friendly toleration of foreign Powers. A million a year is a large sum to expend on an object which would be finally effected if Cuba were annexed either to Mexico or to the United States. Some years since, it appeared to the English Government that, as Cuba is smaller than Africa, it would be easier to watch the ports of demand than to intercept the supply. The American Government, however, protested against the presence of the English squadron in the Gulf of Mexico, and the SUMNERS and SEWARDS were especially prominent in patriotic denunciation of the usurping foreigner. The blockade has since been facilitated by the Federal concession of a right of search, for slavers can no longer protect themselves by the use of the American flag. The price of slaves in Cuba is raised by the difficulty of importation, and perhaps, if it rose to an unremunerative point, the trade would be discontinued. As, however, the artificial price would disappear with the withdrawal of the squadron, there can be no doubt that, unless the system is suppressed in Cuba, the trade can only be discountenanced by the employment of force.

Lord STANLEY boldly questioned both the duty and the expediency of a perpetual crusade against slavery. After sixty years since the prohibition of the Slave Trade, and thirty years from the abolition of slavery, he affirmed that any supposed debt of humanity to Africa was cancelled by efflux of time. There was something almost paradoxical in the expression of his opinion that the life of a single naval officer was often more than an equivalent for all the negroes who had been saved from transportation to Cuba, and it was perhaps imprudent to repudiate all responsibility for the fortunes of the African race. Lord STANLEY is not in general a retailer of commonplace sophisms, but his proposal that, instead of civilizing the Africans, Parliament had better look at home, involved a familiar fallacy. There may be, as Lord STANLEY said, within five miles of the Houses of Parliament, persons who need civilizing as much as the negro; but there is no incompatibility between improvement at home and the exercise of beneficial influence abroad—if, indeed, it is beneficial—by the employment of a part of the navy on the African coast. Lord STANLEY has no intention of proposing a grant for the civilization of suburban savages, and, if he contemplated any plan of the kind, a grant would not be rejected on the ground that the blockading squadron had a prior claim on the national resources. What Lord STANLEY really intends to suggest is, that as money is not spent for the conversion or improvement of indigenous barbarians, it ought with stronger reason to be withheld from remote aliens of an inferior type. The argument is not conclusive, for the policy of suppressing slavery ought to be considered exclusively on its own merits. It is remarkable that the nation which is commonly described by foreigners as especially selfish in its motives and material in its objects has, for half a century, spent annual sums equal to the revenue of a third-rate State for the purpose of promoting a benevolent idea. The impulse of the great Anti-Slavery agitation has naturally died away, as the memory of its success has receded into the remoter past; but, though the continued interference with the Slave Trade is due to the zealous convictions of the generation which remembers WILBERFORCE, even the contemporaries of Lord STANLEY may reasonably object to the sacrifice of results which have been accomplished at so heavy a cost. Within five or ten years some change in the

policy or in the situation of Cuba will probably supersede the necessity for further exertion. The civilization and conversion of the negroes in their native continent must be postponed to an indefinitely distant period. The King of DAHOMEY and the King of ASHANTEE are likely long to furnish a model to African potentates. Kidnapped slaves and their descendants are almost the only negro Christians who are at present to be found in the world.

LADIES AND EXAMINERS.

THE irrepressible Examiner is endeavouring to add a new province to his dominions. One half of creation has hitherto been able to defy his ambition. He has, however, reduced the whole male population to a state of abject bondage. It is becoming as rare to find a man who has not been examined as it was, in happier times, to find a boy who had not been flogged. If the terrors of examination are to be regarded as a modern substitute for those of corporal suffering, the exchange has been a bad one for the victims. Examiners wield a power of subtle torture which might excite the envy of the Inquisition; their machinery has been cunningly contrived to rack every separate faculty of the mind; they can strain your memory till it refuses to bear a further effort, or apparently dislocate your reason in the attempt to perform prodigies of useless ingenuity. Almost every man above five-and-twenty looks back through a horrible vista of these torments. He began at school at twelve years old; at the University he was examined on an average some four times annually; and he did not fairly escape till he became a full-blown barrister or clergyman, beyond the power of readers or examining chaplains. The one source of unmixed pleasure to every man, on taking final leave of his days of youthful subjection, is that he can never be examined again. No human being will ever insist upon his writing a short account of the reign of Henry VIII., or of the geography of British India, or of the tenets of the later schools of Gnostics. He will never again sit down crammed almost to bursting with refreshing statements on such topics, in order painfully to discharge the accumulated information of months. Distressing as the process is, its merits within proper limits are obvious. Unluckily, people seem to acquire a faith in examining, much as surgeons formerly learnt to believe in bleeding. They consider it to be a cure for all the ills which the mind is heir to; and the patients are as ready to take its mysterious efficacy for granted as the doctors to inculcate its reality.

The vigour with which examiners beat the threshold of every profession goes far to make it a serious question, what is to become of the fools? The rather indefinite multitude known as the middle classes have been, to a certain extent, brought into the fold. It is supposed that, by diligently asking them questions, they will be found some day to know something. Considering the quantity of examining that the Universities have to get through in the ordinary course of duty, we should have imagined that this additional task would absorb all their surplus energy. But an entirely new field has just been opened. We shall soon be obliged to say that neither age nor sex is a sufficient protection from the examining fury. A syndicate has, it seems, reported to the University of Cambridge that girls as well as boys might be advantageously admitted to what are called the "non-gremial" examinations. To save the shock to the natural modesty of the young ladies, and to the sense of propriety of the public, no class list is to be published; but successful candidates are to receive certificates, to be distributed by the local committees. The days and hours of the examination are to be precisely the same as for the boys; and, therefore, special subjects of female education are not to be included in the scheme. And thus Cambridge is to extend its influence over the whole of the rising generation. Not content with its proper function of training boys to become men, it is ambitious to prepare girls to become their wives. The wranglers and first-class men of future years will be drawn by an elective affinity to the ladies who have won certificates in classics and mathematics. The foundation of future romances will doubtless be laid in these intellectual contests. Miss So-and-So, some ardent lover will be able to say, was in my year in the middle-class examinations; I beat her in Greek, but she was well ahead of me in the differential calculus. On the other hand, the wretched man who lets out that he was plucked when the object of his affections won a first-class will receive a crushing blow to his hopes. The University Commissioners little knew what they were doing when they sanctioned exceptions to the rule of celibacy. Married Fellows—beings not long since as inconceivable as the merman—begin to form an appreciable part of the whole body. The softening influence of female society is destroying the cynical indifference with which ladies' schools were formerly regarded. The great gulph which was fixed between resident dons and the whole female creation has been bridged over, and the present proposal is doubtless the first symptom of a wider change. The "thin end of the wedge," to use the true Conservative metaphor, has been introduced; and, from setting papers to girls, scholastic authorities of a milder race will gradually admit them to the less doubtful benefits of the University. We are approaching Tennyson's epoch of "sweet girl graduates with their golden hair." In due time, we shall have to discuss the question whether Oxford or Cambridge should be set apart as the Ladies' University. It cannot be denied

that, if Cambridge is ambitious for the honour, it has stolen a march upon its rival. When the system of middle-class examination first took its place among the educational manias of the day, some difficulty was produced by a proposal to offer to competition the "bogus" degree of A.A. Cambridge men alleged that it was a concession unworthy of the University, and that it could only serve as an indirect advertisement. They took it to be an extra bid, and not a very dignified bid, for customers. If so, the present step of Cambridge will more than make up her leeway. If Oxford gives a rather higher price, Cambridge appeals to a doubled audience. One effect of the whole system has probably been, whether intentionally or not, to advertise the Universities. It has made their merits more widely known than was formerly the case, and a decided increase in their numbers during the last few years has probably been partly due to this cause. The effect of giving ladies an interest in the scheme will be to advertise with double vigour. The fame of the University which can boast of being the only one to recognise woman's intellectual rights will doubtless spread rapidly. It will be industriously praised by a class who have singular powers of lavishing eulogies upon themselves and their friends—the thorough-going social reformers. The great Association for mutual admiration which meets annually under the pretext of talking Social Science possesses, amongst other things, first-rate puffing power. No doubt the praises of an enlightened University will be vigorously sung by strong-minded ladies, and by gentlemen who advocate female suffrage. Papers filled with statistics will demonstrate to admiring audiences that the female intellect is able to join in equal contest with the male, and will attribute to the University of Cambridge the honour of the demonstration. There are probably people who accept such eulogies with complacency. Praise is praise, whatever its consistency. An advertisement is equally useful, however grotesque, so long as it attracts attention. Those who like to see the University anointed with third-rate incense rather than anointed with nothing will doubtless contemplate the prospect with unmixed satisfaction.

Cynical minds will, we fear, continue to ask what good end is likely to be obtained. Have the middle-class examinations been proved to exert such a healthy influence upon boys' education that we are bound not to withhold them from girls? The question will possibly be answered with more certainty when the Education Commission now sitting makes its Report. Meanwhile, certain shortcomings are obvious enough. The system cannot really discharge the functions of an efficient school-inspector. It is a makeshift which is better than nothing, but which incidentally produces some positive evils. It puts a direct premium upon the practice of cramming two or three prize boys. It is the obvious interest of the schoolmaster to spend his powers exclusively upon producing two or three exceptional specimens, which are to the bulk of the school what the gigantic beasts at a cattle show are to their lean brethren; all cultivation bestowed upon the less fertile soil is so much trouble thrown away. Such a partial application of a stimulus to scholastic industry is very unsatisfactory at best; and if it tends to hinder the introduction of a more rational system, it is so far injurious. It seems evident, at the same time, that the Universities cannot, by their unaided powers, go very much farther. To apply a thorough test to any large number of schools requires far greater means than they have at their disposal. It is already a source of some wonder that men enough can be obtained to work the actual examining machinery of the Universities; and as that machinery is almost annually extended, while much of the labour is done for merely nominal payment, the difficulty tends to increase. We should certainly fancy that scope enough could be found for the whole disposable energy, without going beyond the walls of the Universities themselves. Whatever may have been the motives for examining "non-gremial" boys, the occupation seemed to be on the outside limit of the legitimate sphere of University action; and when they take a step still farther into the non-gremial world, they appear to us to get decidedly beyond the outside limits. The objections to the former scheme apply to this with still greater force. The conditions with which the Syndicate fence themselves round show that they feel a natural modest hesitation. They dare do all that does become a syndicate, but they have evidently an uneasy feeling that they are doing a little more. The list of names, for example, is not to be published. If ladies were merely trying out of curiosity whether they could actually go through an examination, as ladies sometimes have been known to try whether they could smoke a cigar, it would be right to keep the result strictly private; but, as the scheme is intended for practical working, we fear that the additional stimulus of publicity will be demanded. Ladies will not be satisfied with keeping a certificate locked up at home. If they are to partake the toil of the boys, they will wish to share the glory also. Then, again, the University is not to examine into subjects of special female education. What those subjects are we do not exactly know, beyond a vague impression that the use of the globes must be one; we do not see, however, why it should not be a fit subject for examination. But the fact is, that the Syndicate felt that they were treading delicate ground. They were not quite certain that they were not doing something slightly improper, and they tried to guard themselves by raising any limitation that could be suggested, even though the reasons for it were not very clear. It looked well to disavow interference as much as possible, even whilst they were interfering. If the University examination is to exercise any influence,

this provision must surely be a bad one; because it would directly tend to make girls neglect the studies, whatever they may be, which are specially adapted for women. If it merely betrays a suspicion that the University is a very unfit body to deal with the question, we fully concur in it. The Syndicate might, however, have thought of this a little earlier. The University, without exceeding its own appropriate duty, can exercise a very important influence upon the education of the country. When it tries to intrude itself into subjects with which it can of necessity only deal in the most partial manner, it will probably suffer in dignity, and do no good to its clients.

Of course we may be met by the school who deny that any difference exists between the intellects of men and women, and who infer that no difference should exist between their education. Such people, no doubt, expect that the admission of women to the advantages of a university education would cause an immediate growth of female Bacon, Newtons, and Miltons. We give no opinion upon this rather extensive question. So long, however, as women practically abstain from male occupations—and it seems not unlikely that in England they will abstain for some time longer—they will require a different education to fit them for their duty in life. The disposition to join in competitive examinations is the logical complement of a disposition to join in other contests of life. When ladies exercise the suffrage, go to the bar, walk the hospitals, and fill the pulpit, ladies may also become senior wranglers and take double firsts. Meanwhile, we think the less they have to do with it the better. We should regret to see the University of Cambridge making itself ridiculous, and taking a great deal of trouble to exercise a function beyond its province. We hope that the common sense for which it is generally distinguished will lead it to draw the line somewhere to bound this intolerable trick of endless examination.

THE ARM OF FLESH.

THE extension of missionary enterprise has been accompanied of late years with sundry developments calculated to furnish matter for much pious self-congratulation. In this branch of our duties we have very greatly improved upon that rudimentary Christianity which was prevalent in the Apostolic age. There may be traces of progress in other respects, but nowhere perhaps are they so marked as here. What is the gradual leavening of society when compared with the mushroom growth of our great associations? Of course no prudent man would wish to push his disparagement of the first centuries to any undue lengths, and the Primitive Church is far too convenient a weapon in theological controversy to be altogether thrown aside. But the modern religionist may still permit himself to look with a complacent eye on the admirable perfection of existing arrangements for getting in subscriptions, and even to cherish a modest doubt whether St. Augustine himself would have been equal to the composition of a Report. The very existence of Lord Shaftesbury is a proof that "they didn't know everything down in Judee." What would the President of the Bible Society have done before the invention of printing? But perhaps the greatest improvement of all is to be found in the masterly use which our missionaries make of the safeguards of modern diplomacy. It was all very well for St. Paul to say that his weapons were spiritual, when there were no others to be had; but the mention of this fact ought not to stand in any one's way now that the prospects of Christianity have improved, and a supply of carnal artillery has been added to the spiritual outfit. Persecution and martyrdom are well enough in their proper place, and when a man cannot help himself he is quite right in trying to look as though he liked them; but if the Apostles had had an ambassador to fall back upon, they would have spoken in a different strain. In theory, indeed, everything remains unchanged, and the preacher still goes forth with his life in his hands. But he finds a store of consolation in the thought that he has his passport neatly folded between the pages of his pocket Bible, and that his every step is taken beneath the eye of Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He has a very early authority in favour of appealing unto Cæsar, and fortunately, in his case, Cæsar is ubiquitous in the person of the British Consul.

These beneficent changes have naturally contributed very materially to the dissemination of Scriptural truth. A consciousness that there is no danger is an admirable preservative against nervous terrors, and even a missionary may feel additionally venturesome when he is performing on a low rope. We are not surprised, therefore, that the numerous supporters of the Protestant Missions in Constantinople should have felt alarmed at the recent acts of the Turkish authorities; and where a good many ladies of advanced age are concerned in getting up an agitation, it is equally natural that they should cry out considerably before they are hurt. At all events, in the present instance, they have made full use of this latter privilege. Ever since 1856, the Turkish Government has accorded, both to foreigners and to its own subjects, a very liberal measure of religious toleration. The various forms of Christian belief have been placed amongst the recognised religions of the State; conversions from Mahometanism have been freely permitted; the Turkish translation of the Bible has been allowed to be publicly sold; and the Protestant clergy have been suffered to perform service in Turkish in their authorized chapels and schoolrooms. Not unnaturally, the missionaries, having obtained so much, became anxious to push their advantages further. Two of them accordingly opened rooms in public inns situated in the

very centre of the Mahomedan quarter, and greatly resorted to by travellers from the interior of Asia, and put forward some of their Turkish converts to deliver lectures against the Mahomedan religion. There is nothing to show that either Fınd Pasha, the Grand Vizier, or Ali Pasha, the Foreign Minister, had any personal objection to these measures. These two Ministers are the natural leaders of the tolerant, or indifferent, party in Turkey, and they can have no possible object in strengthening the hands of the fanatics who are their bitterest opponents. But they seem to have become alarmed at the possible effect of such proceedings on the religious sensitiveness of the Turkish people, and in the month of July last they suddenly closed the rooms in the inns, as well as the shops which had been established for the sale of Bibles, and arrested the converts who had been employed as preachers in the former. The English Ambassador promptly remonstrated, and on its being discovered that the Bible shops had been leased to a British subject, they were at once reopened, and Sir Henry Bulwer was assured that the regular sale of Bibles was not objected to, and was not intended to be interfered with. The arrest of the converts was justified on the ground of there being good reason to fear that an attack would be made on them by the more zealous of their own relations, and that this, if allowed to come to a head, might be the forerunner of a general religious outbreak. A few of them professed themselves Mussulmans immediately upon their capture, and were thereupon released, while the rest were removed from Constantinople and set at liberty after a short delay. The two points on which the Turkish Government held out were the closing of the rooms in the inns, and the prohibition of the dissemination of Bibles except at the authorized shops; and even the latter was ultimately surrendered, and the practice of hawking Bibles about the streets was acquiesced in, if not sanctioned.

It may seem perhaps that, for a country where the Koran is still the law of the land, these were not bad terms for a foreign Ambassador to obtain, but the various missionary organizations appear to have judged differently. A hundred pages of a Parliamentary paper are filled with little else than a string of absurd accusations against Sir Henry Bulwer, and of the most arrogant assertions ever made by the subjects of one Government of a prescriptive right to interfere in the affairs of another. The first in the field was the British and Foreign Bible Society. They "call for loud remonstrance and decided action on the part of the British Minister," and they "claim the fullest liberty of disposing of the Holy Scriptures by sale or otherwise throughout the whole Turkish Empire," on the practical and business-like ground that they have paid the duty prescribed by the Turkish tariff. A fixed duty and an unfettered Bible would not be a bad cry on which to go to the country in an Evangelical and agricultural district, and we recommend it to the attention of candidates at the ensuing general election who see their way to combining Protestantism and Protection. That it has no meaning at all out of Turkey, and very little in it, will hardly be thought an objection by a sufficiently buccolic constituency. With an intelligent appreciation of the man they have to deal with, the Society reminds Lord Russell that his life has been devoted to "the cause of civil and religious liberty," and expresses a modest confidence that he "will not allow this liberty and freedom of conscience to be violated with impunity in any country in which the indignant remonstrance of the English nation can be successfully made." Lord Russell was naturally moved by this judicious reference to his past services, and he accordingly instructed Sir Henry Bulwer to urge the Turkish Government to recognise the hawking of Bibles "as an essential and indispensable part of religious liberty." Ali Pasha declined—not, as it seems to us, without good reason—to admit any vested right in a society of foreigners to distribute any publication whatever without let or hindrance; but the impression left on the Ambassador's mind was that, if nothing more was said, the permission would be tacitly continued. "In asking the Porte to do anything you are likely to be refused; in expressing a wish that it should do nothing your wish is likely to be gratified." The Committee of the Evangelical Alliance were able to furnish Lord Russell with a further argument in the same behalf. According to this theory, the right to hire rooms in public inns for the purpose of denouncing Mohammedanism was purchased by the blood and treasure expended by the British nation during the Crimean war. If we are to believe these gentlemen, it is quite a mistake to suppose that we fought at Inkermann or Balaklava merely to keep Constantinople out of the hands of Russia; we went to war for an idea just as much as France did in Italy, and, to make our unselfishness more conspicuous, we have won this great privilege for others as well as for ourselves. Perhaps the most singular part of the whole correspondence is the coolness with which the American missionaries lecture the English Ambassador on his political and religious duties, and conveniently omit all reference to the Minister of the United States. To what extent Lord Russell adopts this theory of our policy in the East does not clearly appear; but perhaps his silence is to be attributed to a consciousness that Ali Pasha has beaten him at his own weapons. "Even England," says the Turkish Minister, "still preserves some restrictions on liberty of conscience. Amongst these it will be sufficient to cite the severe penalties prescribed by a law in the reign of William III. for those who, by speaking, teaching, or writing, deny the truth of the Christian religion and the Divine authority of the Holy Scripture." After this Lord Russell's occupation was clearly gone. To have the bread taken out of his mouth in this way by a foreigner and a Turk was more than he could be expected to put up with. If he carried the discussion any further, even Lord Somers

himself might not be safe from the polluting touch of the false prophet; and, for the first time in his life, Lord Russell did not "feel called upon to defend the laws and Government of the British Empire." Here therefore, it may be hoped, the question will rest. But it is worth while to point out that the pretensions set up by the missionaries, and to some extent acquiesced in by Lord Russell, amount to nothing short of the establishment of a Protestant protectorate, to be vested in Great Britain, which shall be at least as extensive and overbearing as the Greek protectorate to which Russia laid claim before the Crimean war. It is quite possible that, if England chooses to make such a demand, Turkey may be compelled to concede it. But it is a further question whether it is either just or prudent to build up with one hand, while we pull down with the other—to maintain the integrity of the Turkish Empire against the millions of Greek Christians, and at the same time to take the government practically into our own hands, in order to win a nominal triumph for an aggressive Protestantism which in the East is only a costly exotic.

DEBATING SOCIETIES.

THE Cambridge Union Society is about to erect a new building. Long penance for the sins of extravagant predecessors has been done in a dingy edifice, from which the taint of former employment as a Dissenting chapel could never be quite effaced. The result—creditable to recent generations of undergraduates—has been the accumulation of sufficient funds to buy a suitable piece of land. With the assistance of old members, enough will doubtless be raised for the projected building. We hope that it may combine sufficient architectural beauty with that more important condition of future prosperity which is implied in due internal comfort. Considered merely in its character of an ordinary club, the Union is valuable to the University; but it rises almost to historical celebrity as a debating society. Many distinguished men have poured forth their early floods of nonsense within its walls, with excellent results to themselves and their friends. Debating societies are indeed an institution which the English youth is apt to regard with some distrust. Amongst his more engaging qualities is a certain insurmountable modesty. The youth of some nations take to speaking spontaneously. The Yankee delivers political orations almost from his cradle. He has no sense of awkwardness when apostrophising Liberty and the Genius of the Constitution to a crowded audience. He is apparently insensible to the profound diffidence which besets even elderly Englishmen when once hopelessly planted upon their legs. The British orator, until hardened by long practice, always suffers from a lurking impression that he is making a fool of himself. He feels that he is unnaturally and portentously conspicuous. If possible, he deprecates all criticism by burying himself under mountains of commonplace. He takes refuge in some of those established formulae which constitute the recognised apology for saying nothing. A youthful audience is apt to be specially intolerant. If the orator labours under a half-conscious conviction that he is doing something exquisitely silly, they heartily concur in his opinion. An undergraduate always describes himself as a "man," but he is much too modest to presume upon the character. So long as he is engaged in a boyish pursuit, he is safe from painful rebukes to his self-esteem. He is proud of keeping up an interest in games which, in more precocious races, are reserved for schoolboys. He has an almost cynical contempt for performances designed to ape the ways of his elders. There is no character which he condemns more energetically, and indeed more sensibly, than that of a youthful prig. This sentiment is frequently carried to excess, and real childishness is pardoned more easily than an affectation of premature wisdom. In the variety of Muscular Christian depicted in *Tom Brown at Oxford*, the element of character known to writers of sermons and sermonizing novels as mainly simplicity is developed rather to the prejudice of his intellect. On the whole, however, we perhaps prefer *Tom Brown* for a general model to the premature statesman and philosopher. The youth who takes to Unionic oratory has thus to win applause from a rather grudging audience. His flights of eloquence are taken at a heavy discount outside his own circle of admirers. It would be of course easy to make out a strong case against him. It is the condition under which he speaks that he should talk with an energy proportioned to his want of knowledge. The trick of filling up gaps of total ignorance with empty declamation succeeds more easily then than in after-life. It requires unusual genius to sink your own misgivings sufficiently to imitate the spontaneous audacity of a very young man. Few people can even pretend to believe, after five-and-twenty, that they have an infallible solution for all political problems. It required a very youthful nobleman to put us all to rights about Reform, without even a latent consciousness that any difficulties had escaped him, or that his logic was not perfectly novel and irresistible. Hence, if the mere absurdity of what a man says were a sufficient proof that he ought to hold his tongue, we could easily quote enough bursts of rhetoric to shut the doors of the Union for ever. It is not that the argument is weak, for it would be impossible to surpass, and difficult to match, the feebleness of many of the arguments gravely propounded in Parliament. The characteristic weakness of early rhetoric is the complacency with which it propounds the most sweeping assertions. Mr. Carlyle gives us a rather favourable specimen of Union eloquence, attributed to Sterling. "Has she not" ("she" refers to the Church of England) "a black dragoon in every parish, on good pay and rations, horse meat and man's meat, to patrol and battle for these

things?" Upon which Mr. Carlyle remarks, that Sterling must then have been a Radical, "or, in other words, a young ardent soul looking with hope and joy into a world which was infinitely beautiful to him, though overhung with falsities and foul cobwebs as world never was before." This expression is not, we presume, intended to convey a definition of Radicals in general, who, in fact, are often "quite other" than young ardent souls; but it is a poetical way of describing the particular species of Radical generated in debating clubs. They certainly are apt to look upon the world as full of falsities and foul cobwebs, and to class under that head a large enough section of society to please Mr. Carlyle himself. Lord Amberley, the other day, exemplified the very essence of this class of eloquence when he said that he had no objection to violent changes in the Constitution. Of course he had not. The destruction of the House of Lords, the abolition of the Established Church and of the present system of landed tenure, would seem to many youthful politicians to be moderate steps towards the introduction of a satisfactory Reforming policy. The same thoroughgoing contempt for half-measures would, of course, characterize our foreign policy. We ought by this time to have been parceling the United States into five or six Confederations, or engaged in exterminating the surviving Southern slaveholders. When there was some doubt whether the desire for retaliation might not carry us too far in India, we remember a young orator panting for the time, to use his own words, when every gallows in Bengal should creak beneath its ghastly load, and the mouth of every gun be strewn with the mangled remains of massacred mutineers. This burst of eloquence was of course only superficially bloodthirsty; it was, in substance, an eloquent expression of really amiable feeling.

It would, however, be obviously absurd to condemn the practice of debating because it leads to the display of much harmless nonsense. Our most sacred institutions might well tremble at such a precedent; even clergymen might begin to be afraid for their sermons. A clergyman may indeed say that, if he occasionally talks nonsense about sacred subjects, it is only because the law compels him to talk something. He is not making a spontaneous and supererogatory display of his powers. Utilitarians and pedants are apt to ask whether young men cannot be better employed than in purposeless oratory. Everything which does not tend to the authorized goal of a University education is accounted a useless distraction. This, however, is a very narrow view of the question. The least important part of a man's education is often that which he imbibes from the official sources. When he has been once furnished with the necessary intellectual tools, with a fair knowledge of reading and writing and language, he improves fastest by trying to use them for himself. Success in a University career is so often due to the faculty of simply receiving ready-made knowledge that any kind of original effort is a valuable corrective. When two or three young men get together and solve metaphysical and theological problems, they doubtless arrive at astounding conclusions. Their theology strays very widely from the orthodox path; their metaphysical speculations lead to about as much result as those of their elders, and impose upon them to a much greater degree. They may, perhaps, in later years see grounds to modify their conclusions. The Bishop may remember that he has been rather disrespectful to the Old Testament; and a Prime Minister that he advocated an equal distribution of land. But if they are candid, they will admit that the discussions did them a great deal of good; they are not really the worse for having played at a little socialism and infidelity; extravagant opinions get shaken off only too easily in later years, and the useful effect of the intellectual exercise remains. It has been carried on with an enthusiasm which seldom accompanies studies in the prescribed direction, and is likely to produce a mature taste for the subjects to which they have taken spontaneously, instead of the hearty disgust for those which have been imposed upon them. Speeches at the Union are thus useful, if they merely induce a young man to give some attention to the questions of the day. The practice of talking the most outrageous democratical doctrines is a very good means of getting to know what democracy really means. You unconsciously arrive at an appreciation of the opinions whose expression you have adopted. The best way of learning a foreign language is to talk it; and it is not a bad way of becoming ultimately an intelligent politician to spout premature fragments of political phraseology. Nor should we do justice to the orators of the Union without admitting that they frequently rise to really good speaking. The body of the argument is generally flimsy enough, but the power of dressing it in forcible language comes to perfection before the reasoning faculty has been sufficiently developed or trained by experience. The ability to speak is in itself an undoubtedly useful accomplishment, and can be best acquired at an early age. When a man has once learnt to face any audience with self-possession, he never quite forgets the art, and he feels the absurdity of his position less keenly in proportion to his youth.

It is still plainer that this rhetorical distinction proves the possession of some ability than that it tends to develop it. It implies the absence of an inconvenient amount of modesty, and the presence of an exuberance of talking power which is at least incompatible with the helpless form of stupidity. A speaker at the Union may, indeed, not improbably belong to the great genus bore; he may be one of the genuine pachydermatous race, who suffers from an irresistible desire to improve his education at the expense of his neighbours. But as in a debating society there is no compulsory attendance, it requires an unusual degree of persist-

ence to continue long to bestow his tediousness upon empty benches. To possess this tenacity of character is a most useful accomplishment. A man who can talk on obstinately with no one listening, and with no excuse for talking except a simple desire to talk, must possess irrepressible vigour. He must be one of those unquenchable bores who, by a continuous deadlift effort, always succeed in pushing into a comfortable corner in life. The more common and more attractive class of speaker gives evidence of good qualities less obnoxious to the rest of his species. Whatever cynics may say, the disposition to make speeches for the sake of making speeches is a healthy sign. It indicates more than average vivacity of intellect, and a disposition to go a little outside of the regular track, which is sometimes due to an abnormal development of conceit, but more frequently to the harmless self-complacency of a clever youth. As a rule, the reputation of mock Parliamentary eloquence is taken for rather less than it deserves. It is a sign of ability which does not come within the recognised official standard, and is viewed with doubtful eyes by the unofficial part of the University. But we should be sorry to see a serious decline in the candidates for oratorical glory, or in the Society which has so long provided an arena for their debates.

THE LAW OF EVIDENCE.

THERE are at this moment three Bills before the House of Commons for the reform of the law of evidence, all of them eminently characteristic of the illogical timidity with which it is our English custom to approach a question of principle. The Bills, however, are worthy of all attention. They propose, however awkwardly in point of form, to remove a glaring anomaly and injustice, and they stand upon a principle which, after much debate, has now been for the last ten years sanctioned by the Statute-Book, approved by the Judges, and cordially welcomed by the voice of the whole community. Sir Fitzroy Kelly, in introducing one of these Bills, summed up with unaccustomed terseness the history of the English law of evidence as regards the testimony of parties to criminal or civil proceedings. The ancient rule of English law, however injurious and unjust its working might be, was not at all anomalous or illogical. Under the old practice, two maxims had ingrained themselves into the whole system of procedure. One was, that none but thoroughly disinterested testimony should be listened to; the other, that no man should be compelled to criminate himself. The first maxim excluded not only persons under accusation in criminal or quasi-criminal investigations, but every party to a civil suit, and every witness who had the remotest pecuniary interest in the question. The objection to this doctrine was, that it shut out in most cases the evidence of those who were best acquainted with the facts, and in many cases caused a total failure of justice. The one argument in its favour was, that it saved courts of justice, to a certain extent, from the scandal of frequent perjury. By successive steps, Lord Denman and Lord Brougham succeeded in demolishing the old principle, and it is now acknowledged that the duty of a court of justice is to use every means of ascertaining the truth, leaving the danger of perjury to be met by the terrors of the law. The wisdom of this revolution—for it was nothing less—in our judicial procedure has been abundantly confirmed by subsequent experience. The truth is got out in thousands of cases where it would formerly have been concealed, and though it is true that perjury may, to some extent, have increased, the power of cross-examination has sufficed to prevent it from being often successful. But, in introducing the new principle of searching out the truth at all hazards, the Legislature saddled it with exceptions which could only be justified on the assumption that the principle itself might turn out to be a mistake, and ought, therefore, to be admitted only in a partial and tentative fashion. While the evidence of parties is admitted for what it is worth in all other cases, no one accused of crime or adultery is allowed to testify in his own defence. The same disqualification extends to the husband or wife of the accused. In such cases, it seems to have been thought that the temptation to perjury would be so great that it would be better to let justice halt for want of evidence than to put a witness into the box who might be induced to add a solemn falsehood to the offence of which he had already been guilty. Unfortunately, this tender care for the consciences of guilty persons (for it is only on the hypothesis of guilt that the temptation would exist) has the effect of adding fearfully to the peril of an innocent man unjustly accused. The maxim that it is better that ten guilty men should escape than that one innocent man should suffer is in spirit grossly violated by a rule which deprives a man labouring under groundless accusations of the opportunity of clearing his character, lest in another case a real criminal should be tempted to lie. We have put the apology for the existing law solely on the ground of the possible increase of perjury which its repeal might lead to, because the only other arguments adduced in its favour are utterly untenable. The risk of a jury being misled into an erroneous acquittal by the testimony of the prisoner is one which need not be taken into account. For one guilty prisoner who could thus deceive a jury, there would be a score whose evidence would serve only to remove any previous doubt of their guilt. Nor would there be any new danger to a really innocent man. The possibility of being wrongly convicted on false or circumstantial evidence arises mainly from the rejection of the prisoner's evidence, while cross-examination, so far from shaking the story of an

innocent man, would be his strongest possible safeguard against a wrong conviction. The tentative period may now be considered past, and the only substantial question is, whether the principle of admitting all evidence for what it is worth has been a success or a failure to the extent to which it has been tried. If a success, there should be an end of all exceptions. If a failure, we ought to revert to the old law which has been so universally condemned. But, until the Legislature is prepared to decide this question one way or the other, it will be better to abstain from any more piecemeal legislation.

Of the three Bills before the House, Mr. Scully's proposes to render all accused persons competent, but not compellable, to give evidence on their own behalf, subject to a compulsory cross-examination. Sir Fitzroy Kelly proposes, in effect, the same enactment, both as to divorce suits and criminal proceedings; but the two portions of his Bill are carefully separated, with an evident dread of raising the question of principle on its true basis. Mr. Denman also has a Bill which, though it does not touch the main question raised by Sir Fitzroy Kelly and Mr. Scully, deals with a number of minor impediments to the administration of criminal justice, which are also provided for by the subordinate clauses of Sir Fitzroy Kelly's measure. It will be observed that, while removing the obstacle to the reception of the evidence of the accused, all these Bills are carefully framed so as not to trench upon the principle that no man shall be compellable to criminate himself. If a prisoner chooses to volunteer his evidence, he must of course be subject to cross-examination upon it, which would often have the effect of criminating him if he were really guilty. Whether, on such a cross-examination, he should be compelled to answer a question directly criminating him is of very little importance, as a refusal to answer would in that case be as effectual an answer as he could give. In this way the privilege of bearing testimony in his own favour would undoubtedly be a fatal gift to many a guilty man, whether he availed himself of it and broke down under cross-examination, or preferred to bear the stigma which his silence would cast upon him. The only point worthy of a moment's consideration is whether an innocent man could possibly be endangered by the right of telling his own tale. On this, we believe, there is not room for the shadow of a doubt. Cross-examination may often embarrass a truthful witness, and thus diminish the weight which properly belongs to his evidence; but, having regard to the stringency of the proof required in criminal cases, to the protection afforded by the Bench, and to the feeling on the part of prosecuting counsel against seeking a conviction by any unfair pressure, it may almost be said to be impossible that any innocent man should find himself in a worse position by being rendered competent to give evidence in explanation or denial of the case made against him. On the other hand, almost all the wrong convictions which now occasionally happen would be prevented if the prisoner, by telling a tale which will bear cross-examination, should have the opportunity of presenting his side of the case to a jury. Whether the feeling of Parliament or the country is yet ripe for a change which must sooner or later be made, remains to be proved; but the half-measure of relaxing the law of evidence in suits on the ground of adultery, while leaving the existing rule in force in proceedings more technically of a criminal nature, has nothing whatever to recommend it except that it would be an illogical step in the right direction, which might ultimately be followed by more consistent legislation.

In itself, however, the proposed change in the practice of the Divorce Court is sound enough. No one has answered, or, as we believe, can answer, the reasoning of Mr. Justice Wilde in the letter which Sir Fitzroy Kelly read to the House. Speaking of the present law of evidence in the Divorce Court, Sir James Wilde says:—"It works a great injustice, for, as the law now stands, the sayings, writings, and acts of the accused are all given in evidence against him, and he is obliged to stand by and hear them without the power of saying one word to explain them away. I do not hesitate to say that this is a grievous hardship to the individual, and a great impediment to the discovery of truth. I will only add that these evils would be effectually cured by a law which should render the parties admissible in all cases, but compellable on the question of adultery in none." Every word of this applies with equal force to every criminal trial. The only difference is, that instead of the hardship being felt in an occasional case, like *Codrington v. Codrington*, it is rather the rule than the exception in ordinary trials. That Mrs. Codrington should have had her lips sealed after Mrs. Watson's evidence of her alleged confession was a monstrous hardship on the hypothesis of the lady's innocence; but not a greater hardship than it is for a prisoner charged with a murder or a robbery to hear Policeman Smith detail the words of an alleged conversation between himself and the accused, which, as presented to the Court, may be an express or implied confession of guilt. It is quite true that the power of giving evidence, whether in the Divorce Court or at the Assizes, would often be fatal to a person justly accused, who might otherwise have had a chance of escape; but if it is essential to the protection of innocent though suspected wives, it is not less essential for the safety of prisoners who, on circumstantial or other evidence, may be wrongfully accused of any other offence. In both cases there would be the strongest possible temptation to perjury on the part of a guilty defendant, but in both the effect of cross-examination would be to prevent the falsehood misleading a jury, however much it might soil the not unspotted character of the witness. Even the notion

that the moral repugnance to perjury might be relied on in the Divorce Court with more confidence than at the Assizes is scarcely tenable; for although it is true that the witnesses on questions of adultery are, in many cases, subject to restraints unknown to the felonious classes, it is equally true that the opinion of society does not condemn as strongly as it ought to do the falsehood of a co-respondent who may seek to clear the character of the woman he has ruined. So great, indeed, is the laxity of opinion on this point, that it is not uncommon for counsel in such cases to urge a jury to place no reliance on such exculpatory evidence, on the ground that it is almost part of the duty which a man owes to his paramour to testify to the absolute purity of her life. Neither on the ground of the hardship to the accused or the frequent failure of justice, nor from any consideration of expediency, is it possible to draw any distinction between divorce suits and criminal trials which would justify the application of different rules of evidence. Whether the law ought to be relaxed in both classes of cases is a single question, which, whatever view may be taken of it, cannot rationally be divided. It is time that a matter of so much importance should be fully discussed and placed on a consistent basis, without reference to the particular Court in which the latest prominent failure of the old law may have occurred.

LAW COURTS FOR LONDON AND BRISTOL.

IT is rather curious that, just at the same moment that all England is interested in the question of the erection of proper Law Courts in London, nearly the same question should have arisen in the city which, we know not exactly on what ground, calls itself the second city in England. The right of Bristol to that title may fairly be disputed by several other cities. York may put in the baronial title of her chief magistrate, and Manchester, the youngest of English cities, may claim to be, after the capital, the largest. The second rank, however, may be shown, on very high authority, really to belong to Winchester. In the reign of Edward the First, when David of Wales was beheaded and quartered, a great controversy arose, not as to the justice of his execution, which nobody doubted, but as to the disposal of his remains. As he had in divers places compassed the death of his lord the King, his head and quarters were to be set up in divers places. The chief towns of England then put in their claims for portions of the spoil. London got the head without dispute. But who should have the piece next in honour—the right shoulder, the heave-offering of the ancient dispensation? York and Winchester fiercely disputed the point, but Winchester won the prize and carried it off in triumph. The rest of him went to York, Bristol, and Northampton; that is, we imagine, York got the left shoulder and Bristol the right leg. Bristol then, in the days of the great Edward, clearly ranked not second, but only fourth. Thus much we learn from the *Annals of Waverley*, a work which we hope that no one will confound with the novel of the same name.

Bristol, however, whether second or fourth, has antiquities to boast of which were not exactly new even in the time of David. Among them is a house which ranks at least as high among the remains of English secular architecture as the city can rank among English cities. Examples of the domestic architecture of the twelfth century are not met with every day. But, in the house of which we speak, there are distinct remains of a grand Norman hall divided by two ranges of pillars, according to the custom usual in the earliest type of halls—a custom which makes the unlearned and unbelieving so constantly mistake them for churches. If the popular mind, from Lord Palmerston downwards, can hardly understand how any medieval doorway or window can be anything but part of a church, how much harder is it to grasp the fact that a building with a nave and two aisles was never worshipped in by Jesuits or Capuchins, but was simply the grandest room in the house of a king, a baron, or, as we suppose in this case, a great merchant. Such was the old hall of Westminster, such are the halls of Winchester and Oakham, such was also the hall of the house familiar to antiquaries as the house in Small Street, Bristol. Later changes have destroyed the full perfection of the hall, but those changes have introduced splendid work of later styles. A range of noble Perpendicular windows and a series of magnificent Cinque-cento fireplaces would, even without the earlier portions, give the building a high place among the ancient houses of England. We may add that, as the house is known as Colston's House, we infer that it was at one time the dwelling-place of the modern patron saint of Bristol, that munificent citizen whom Bristol yearly worships with one consent, though local and political parties find it expedient to worship him at separate shrines. The building, too, plays an odd part in the history of superstition. Some years back a single room was inaccessible; it was locked and never opened. An antiquary of unusual stature, or one who had zeal enough to fetch a chair for the purpose, might, by looking through a light over the door, get a glimpse of one of the finest fireplaces in the house. But no nearer examination was allowed. The room thus tabooed was the temple of the once famous sect of Johanna Southcote. At the time of which we speak, all Bristol could number only one of the faithful; he could not form a congregation by himself; so all worship of the Southcotean persuasion ceased in the city; only the one survivor clung to the scene of his former devotions with an affection not the less touching because it was somewhat oddly displayed. The worthy man continued to pay a yearly

rent of—if we rightly remember—twenty pounds, no longer for the use of the sacred room, but for the privilege of keeping all profane feet from crossing the hallowed threshold.

Now it happens that Bristol is at this moment thought to need new Law Courts for its local business, just as London needs new Courts for the general business of the nation. The same difficulty about sites arises in the lesser city which has arisen in the greater. And one proposal in each case is strikingly analogous to one in the other. As some have proposed to cover up Lincoln's Inn Fields in London, so some have proposed to cover up Queen Square in Bristol—that is, to fill up almost the only free open space in the oldest part of the city. But there is another scheme in Bristol which has no parallel in any of the London schemes. In London, whatever is to be built, nobody proposes to pull down anything that is worth keeping. None of the few antiquities—few comparatively, though many positively—of the capital of England are threatened. When the Houses of Parliament were built, Sir Charles Barry, though he destroyed St. Stephen's Chapel, obligingly "preserved" Westminster Hall, and the decree of preservation has never since been recalled or regretted by any one. Nor does any one propose to destroy Crosby Hall, in quite another region, in order to find a site for the new Palace of Justice. Bristol is less fortunate. There, antiquities are thicker on the ground than they are in London, and perhaps familiarity breeds contempt. One of the schemes therefore proposes to seize upon the house in Small Street as a site for the new Assize Courts. Now this is clearly a scheme which ought not to be entertained as long as some most crying present evil is not involved in the choice of any other. It must be a case of the most pressing kind, such a case indeed as hardly ever can be brought forward, which could justify the depriving Bristol and England of one of the most precious pieces of antiquity which they possess. Unfortunately, the value of the building is almost wholly historical, so that the importance of its preservation may be less easily understood than in some other cases. Colston's House is not exactly an ornament to the city, like the church of St. Mary Redcliff. So neither is Crosby Hall. In both cases you might walk along the street without at all suspecting what was behind. Colston's House might, as far as its outside is concerned, be an ordinary house of the seventeenth century, such as may be seen anywhere, such as one would prefer to preserve if possible, but over which one would make no special lamentation if real necessity called for its destruction. All the valuable portions, early and late, are inside, and are very likely not familiarly known, even to the citizens of Bristol. We are not surprised then if ignorant people wonder at the value which those who are better informed attach to the building. Both the local Society of Architects and the Royal Institute of British Architects have very properly sent in memorials to the Town Council, praying for the preservation of Colston's House. For this they are made the objects of some silly ribaldry in one of the local papers. It is hardly worth while to quote such stuff, but one sentence is amusing. The architects, general and local, are ready to do all sorts of terrible things—among others, to disregard "property interests," whatever those may be—rather "than that a millium which can be assigned to the period of Henry the Eighth, or a corbel pertaining to the age of Elizabeth, should be removed from its original position." This amusingly shows how far back the historical researches of the *Bristol Daily Post* have gone. That paper must be a devotee of what, in Oxford language, is called the "second period;" it clearly believes, perhaps that the world was created, certainly that the city of Bristol was built, about the time of "the Reformation." It is, however, right to say that another local paper, the *Daily Bristol Times and Mirror*, writes in a way showing great good taste and good feeling, and, what is of more importance, the ribaldry of the *Daily Post* finds no echo in the Town Council itself. In the debate on the question of site, no member of the Council talked any special nonsense, and one member talked extremely good sense. The matter was referred to a Committee, and of course, till their report is received and voted upon, we cannot tell what site will be chosen, or whether Colston's House is in any real danger or not.

It becomes, however, the duty of all who value the antiquities of the country, whether locally connected with Bristol or not, to do in the meanwhile all that lies in their power to save a building which is absolutely or nearly unique. "A corbel pertaining to the age of Elizabeth" might be surrendered without any very bitter grief, but Romanesque domestic work, a hall, or even a portion of a hall, of the twelfth century, is quite another affair. The comparative merits of the other sites concern Bristol men and Bristol men only, but the preservation of an important piece of national antiquity is a matter of national concern. And we cannot help hoping that some more worthy use may be found for the building itself, which is at present employed as a printing-office. The difficulty is the same which constantly occurs in London, in Bristol, and in so many other places, and which has doomed so many noble town houses to neglect and destruction. Neither in London nor in Bristol are great merchants now content to dwell at their places of merchandise. We cannot blame them or wonder at them, but we regret the results of the change. See what the banks of the Thames are, and think what they might be, what a glorious row of palaces might line them, if every great London merchant was content, as of old, to live where he makes his wealth. Those times cannot be brought back again; but things might be better than they are, and surely some use, public or private, might be found, which might display the internal beauties of such a building

as Col
at pres
The
the nat
again.
more t
and ov
indeed
differ
place
Foreign
full lig
style w
love fo
will no
fashion
more g
murmur
avalist
it seem
Mr. Ha
testant
why sh

NE
Speech
Session
Under
suppose
commu
the lux
politic
that it
that w
become
last m
war m
or Sir
Weld's
his Imp
have y
to deal
more s
and pro
who he
are shi
to be h
of air,
and jo
ment f
may ec
deliber
rods.
in favor
commen
bably o
the dis
Nichols
lature,
battle v

The
Zealand
Parliam
century
induced
Treaty
with fe
fires of
ceased
native
the str
If, as
war has
and Tas
Chamber
with R
bloodless
adviser
war, w
each o
separate
and a fr
comple
represent
We h
all men
true, an
the pres
alive.
share to
is true
land-job
Office h

as Colston's House to greater advantage than they are displayed at present.

The question of style, which will of course again arise as to both the national and the local Palace of Justice, we will not now argue again. We can only repeat, and very likely we shall have to repeat more than once, arguments which have been brought forward over and over again, and which have never been answered. One thing indeed may be added. A Foreign Office and a Law Court are two different things; one is essentially a place of secrecy, the other a place of publicity. We can fancy that things may be done in a Foreign Office which it might not be convenient to expose to the full light of day blazing through the broad windows of that national style which Lord Palmerston so strangely supposes to have a special love for darkness. But English justice needs no concealments, and will not be afraid of sitting even in a building in which, after the fashion of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there may be really more glass than stone. We see that the *Times* is beginning to murmur some of the old silly talk and to sneer at "gifted mediævalists." On turning to the debate in the House of Commons, it seems that one of the "gifted mediævalists" is no other than Mr. Hadfield of Sheffield. If Mr. Hadfield, surely a sound Protestant, is not afraid of the supposed "Jesuit College" style, why should the *Times* or Lord Palmerston be more timid?

THE CRISIS IN NEW ZEALAND.

NEW ZEALAND and its civil and military politics, even if they had not been introduced to our notice in the Queen's Speech, would have unquestionably claimed, during the present Session, some share of consideration from the Imperial Parliament. Under ordinary circumstances, a Ministerial crisis or a civil war is supposed to afford sufficient excitement, taken separately, for any community, however lethargic. New Zealand generally enjoys the luxury of both these stimulants at once, and so rapidly do the political and martial vicissitudes of the colony succeed each other that it is difficult even to comment with accuracy or advantage on that which, to us, is the latest chapter of its history, before it has become, for all practical purposes, obsolete. The news by the last mail was sufficiently sensational, but, for all we know, the war may by this time have entered on some entirely new phase, or Sir George Grey may have formed new compacts with Mr. Weld's successors, or may have tendered his own resignation to his Imperial masters. The actual events, however, so far as they have yet come to our knowledge, are the only materials we have to deal with, and we have to regret that they do not furnish a more satisfactory basis for sanguine anticipations of colonial peace and prosperity. With the restlessness of the fever-stricken patient who hopes for repose in a change of position, the New Zealanders are shifting their metropolis from Auckland to Wellington. It is to be hoped that the colonial Legislature will benefit by the change of air, that the Southern senators will be enabled to save time and journey-money, and that a removal of the seat of government from the immediate vicinity of the most hostile tribes may secure the Federal Parliament from an interruption of its deliberations by a too sudden substitution of tomahawks for black rods. But the impartial award of the Australian Commissioners in favour of Wellington, whatever may be its future promise of commercial or political advantages to the colony at large, will probably only furnish, for the present, a theme of bickering between the disappointed provinces and their more fortunate rival at Port Nicholson, and a fresh topic of controversy to the colonial Legislature, which seems to have already work enough on hand in doing battle with a newly formed Administration.

The new year opened drearily on our colonists in New Zealand. On the very day of the reassembling of the Imperial Parliament for the Session of 1865, precisely a quarter of a century had elapsed since 512 natives of New Zealand were induced by the representative of the Crown to sign the celebrated Treaty of Waitangi. The whole intervening period has been, with few and brief rays of sunshine, dark and stormy. If the fires of civil warfare have not always blazed, they have never ceased to smoulder; and even if, for the moment, peace between the native and European populations may have seemed to be established, the strife of local officials has burst forth with renewed fierceness. If, as our most recent tidings from the colony inform us, the war has slumbered awhile in the forests and fastnesses of Waikato and Taranaki, it has not raged the less angrily in the Council Chamber at Auckland. If General Cameron has not been fighting with Rewi or Tamihana, Governor Grey has been waging a bloodless, but not less bitter, conflict with his "responsible advisers." By the last accounts, the combatants in this latter war, who had been fiercely brandishing their "memoranda" in each other's faces for a twelvemonth, had been fortunately separated, and Governor Grey had started with a fresh Ministry and a fresh policy, dictated by Mr. Weld in terms which seem to complete, if that were necessary, the humiliation of the Queen's representative.

We have high authority for believing that woe awaits us when all men speak well of us. If the converse of that proposition be true, and any blessing attaches to those who are universally reviled, the present Governor of New Zealand must be the happiest man alive. Nor has the Home Government failed to contribute its share to the honours of Sir George Grey's official martyrdom. It is true that in past years, perplexed by the conflicting appeals of land-jobbers and philanthropists, the authorities at the Colonial Office have, for the most part, been content to be the inactive

spectators of a policy which was gradually drifting those whom they pretended to govern beyond their practical control. A tone of confidence, well tempered with bureaucratic mystery, has supplied the want of any definite policy. But, in the present instance, Sir George Grey, who has broken down under the proverbially impossible task of serving two masters at once, has to thank his principals at home for lighting the match which eventually ignited the pile that is now gradually consuming his official reputation. Under their instructions, he attempted the ungracious and hopeless task of neutralizing the native policy which the Colonial Parliament had, at the express instance of the Duke of Newcastle, reluctantly attempted to direct. And when, as the channel of communication between the Home Government and the Legislature of New Zealand, he was compelled to announce to them three months ago the terms on which alone the Imperial Government would consent to guarantee the loan they asked to supply the exigencies of the war, it was not unnatural that the indignant colonists should pour forth on the Governor, as the nearest and most convenient victim, the vials of their wrath. The consequence has been the separation, by mutual consent, of his Excellency and his responsible advisers, Messrs. Whittaker and Fox, and the formation of the Weld-Sewell Administration on the new programme of fighting their own battles and paying their own bills. How far this spirited and novel policy will command the assent of the Colonial Parliament remains to be proved. Nor is it very clear at present what its precise meaning may be, or whether it may be intended to last longer than the party purposes and arrangements which needed a temporary watchword. That it will be peculiarly distasteful to the Auckland representatives is sufficiently evident. Already we hear of an agitation for the separation of that province from the rest of the colony, on grounds as patriotic as those on which the Provincial Council of Otago demand the release of the Middle Island from her burdensome alliance with her Northern partner.

It must be admitted that seldom, if ever, has so apparently hopeless an embroglio been presented to our notice, even in the history of the British colonies, as in the half-dozen issues now raised by the various contending parties in New Zealand. In the meantime, there is some risk that the very hopelessness of all attempts at any solution may be deemed a sufficient excuse for abandoning the problem in despair. If New Zealand politics look unpromising, they have often, it may be said, worn the same appearance before. Session after Session of the Imperial Parliament has been tided over; nor is there any obvious reason why, in the absence of any pressure from within or from without, the same stereotyped official answers which have done duty in past years should not suffice for all Parliamentary querists in 1865. The Under-Secretary of State, who relieves his more philanthropic *chef* from the "anti-nigger" branch of the Maori business, will no doubt be ready to assure all inquirers in the House of Commons, for the twentieth time during the last two years, that the "New Zealand war is virtually at an end"; and, if he should be further pressed to say why ten or twelve regiments are still left there, he will no doubt be prepared with a satisfactory explanation. If Mr. Roebuck should ask why the destiny of extermination to which he year by year dooms, in oracular tones, the "brown man" in all quarters of our Empire, has not been fulfilled in New Zealand, the alleged vacillations of Governor Grey may serve as a convenient cloak for the compassionate policy of Mr. Cardwell. In return for the usual motions for papers we shall have reams of official correspondence, teeming with unpronounceable names, pitched wholesale on the table of the House of Commons. But the *apices juris* with which the Maori law of real property everywhere bristles will probably become more repulsive than ever to the political student at home when mixed up with squabbles between proconsuls and their subordinates, and the vulgar scramble between the holders of prizes and of blanks in the paltry raffle of colonial faction. Parliament will probably not trouble itself with the disputes of Sir George Grey and his advisers, nor inquire very minutely into the wisdom of the Governor's policy in general, or of his peace proclamation of October last in particular. Lord Palmerston once claimed for a colleague immunity from criticism, on the ground of his absence in the House of Lords. Neither branch of the Imperial Legislature is very likely to condemn unheard a representative of the Crown 12,000 miles away. Whether the Governor or his Ministers were responsible for the escape of the 200 native prisoners now entrenched in the precipices of the Matakana ranges, will be rightly voted a question quite as obsolete and unpractical as the old controversy of the Waitara block, or the everlasting war of words over the policy of Governor Browne.

Unless the tidings just received from the colony, together with the official correspondence already published, compel (as is much to be desired) an early discussion of the topics to which they relate, it will probably not be before the middle of the Session that zealous financial reformers, by patching together the shreds of colonial finance furnished by the Budget and the Army Estimates, will make the discovery that Parliament is pledged to the extent of another round million sterling on New Zealand account; and it will not be till then that we shall hear any audible criticisms of the last year's sayings and doings of our colonists at the antipodes. And then we shall have the old story of a dozen independent members vainly declaiming at midnight to empty benches, in Committee of Supply, over commissariat costs which are already jingling in the pockets of Auckland adventurers, and denouncing a ruinous and inglorious war waged on behalf of fellow-subjects who have sent the Queen's representative to

Coventry, and rallied all the forces of their Legislature and their press to revile the parsimony of the House of Commons, which has ungraciously refused to pay more than four-fifths of the cost of a campaign in the fortunes of which it has no interest, and over the conduct of which it has no control. And when, in spite of a hopeless and barren protest, the bill has been paid in full, New Zealand politics will be in a fair course for revolving again in the vicious circle of past years. Let us hope, however, that on this occasion the functions of the Imperial Government may not be lightly abdicated without a timely effort to grapple with the difficulties of a crisis on which Parliament already possesses ample means of information. It is not by offhand proclamations, still less by Confiscation Acts and martial law, that the knot of Maori government is to be cut. The complicated political diseases of New Zealand are of too long standing and too deeply rooted to be cured at once by superficial remedies. For twenty years they have defied the skill of all the Downing Street doctors, and now that the local practitioners have been called into consultation, and are quarrelling over the case, the hopes of recovery become proportionately remote. It is only in the concentration of public opinion at home on the errors on which our past dealings with native races have been founded, and on the anomalies of a Colonial policy which casts the burdens on the broad shoulders of England and allots the privileges to her colonists, that we can hope for a solution of a controversy which threatens more and more to complicate and embitter our relations, not only with New Zealand, but with other dependencies on which representative institutions have been conferred.

The case of New Zealand, when stripped of all the mysterious jargon in which the controversies of half a century have enveloped it, is really simple enough. A hundred thousand British settlers have thought fit, on a deliberate balance of risks and advantages, to plant themselves in a colony at the antipodes, side by side with a warlike native race. Having made their choice with their eyes open, and with no official inducement, they have in many instances reaped the vast profits awarded to successful enterprise. They received, twelve years ago, a Constitution which gave them absolute control over their own affairs, political and commercial, with a single reservation, dictated not by any greed of Imperial power, but by sincere though mistaken considerations of humanity to the native race. The 73rd clause of the New Zealand Constitution Act—by which British control over native policy, since entirely relinquished, was originally reserved—has been the peg on which the colonists have since supported their claims for perennial protection against the perils incidental to the position in which they have voluntarily placed themselves. Thenceforth all squabbles, no matter how or by whom provoked, between Europeans and Maoris, have been "Imperial." If a settler plunders a native, or swindles him out of his land, and the victim retaliates, the blood which is shed must be avenged by British arms, at the cost of the British taxpayer. And what is the mode of escape suggested to us from this expensive logic? "Suspend the Constitution," says Lord Grey; "recall the political gifts you have conceded; resume the functions of control over the native government which you have abdicated." In other words, "Reduce New Zealand to the level of a Crown Colony which has forfeited the privileges of freedom." How many battalions, or how many millions of money, it would take to carry out this retrograde policy it will be time enough to calculate when it shall have been adopted by Parliament. In the meantime, it may fairly be assumed that it will not be until the destruction of the whole framework of that freedom through which our vast dependencies have attained their present measure of prosperity and vigour that the experiment of absolutism will be tried on the colony of New Zealand. And before that day shall have arrived, we shall probably have learnt to seek in progress, rather than in retrogression, the remedy for our past disasters and the sources of our future strength. Communities to which we have committed the full privileges of self-government can scarcely be expected to tolerate very long any exceptional limitations of their power. Unless we are prepared to admit the highest Imperial criminality and recklessness in the original concession of self-government to our colonies, it is nothing short of a libel on those communities to assume their incapacity to deal as wisely and humanely as ourselves with the native races dwelling within their borders. "Trust me not at all, or all in all," might be the appeal of an enfranchised Colonial Government to the timorous and half-hearted authorities who should thus attempt permanently to withhold with one hand gifts already virtually conceded by the other.

In the interests no less of the Maoris themselves than of the Europeans with whom—for good or evil, in peace or war—it is their inevitable lot to dwell, it is in New Zealand alone that all the local affairs of New Zealand, without exception, must be regulated. If the European populations of both islands—who outnumber their native fellow-subjects by two to one—cannot hold their own and maintain the peace without the aid of Imperial battalions, it can only be on terms to be dictated by Great Britain that the required assistance can be granted or demanded. The Colonial Parliament, if we are to believe the last accounts of its intentions, is prepared to say to us, "Recall your troops, and give us absolute control over our native policy." If this be so, let us take them at their word. Let the settlers be left to fight their own battles in their own way, and we shall probably witness much more circumspection in their dealings with their native neighbours, and less extravagance in spending

their own blood and treasure than they now manifest in the expenditure of ours. This result may be gradual of attainment, but it is only by keeping it steadily in view as the aim and object of our policy that Great Britain can fulfil her high calling as the architect of free and self-reliant communities, which, instead of draining the resources of the parent State through a costly political tutelage of indefinite duration, shall be raised gradually, but certainly, to the rank of equals and allies—the pillars of her material strength, and the monuments of her civilization and her power.

FIELD-MARSHAL LORD COMBERMERE.

A FEW years ago one of the regiments of Guards gave an entertainment at which Lord Combermere was present, and it was stated that he was then the only surviving officer who had served at the battle of Lincelles. The name of this battle is still borne on the colours of the Guards, but the number of persons who could tell when and where it was fought is probably very limited. The length and variety of Lord Combermere's services is shown by the fact that he took part in campaigns which the present generation has almost entirely forgotten. When war was declared by the French Republic against Great Britain in 1793, Lord Combermere, who was born in 1769, was twenty-four years old, and already counted three years of military service. An army was sent under the Duke of York to Holland, and the first guns were fired of a war which lasted with little intermission for two-and-twenty years. The operations of the allies, in which the Duke of York's army bore a part, were at the outset brilliantly successful. Not only was Holland defended, but the defeat of Dumouriez by the Austrians at Neerwinden expelled the French from the Netherlands. The allies crossed the frontier of France, and prepared to besiege Condé and Valenciennes. The Duke of York, on the right of the allies, advanced to the neighbourhood of St. Amand, and here, on the 8th of May, 1793, the British troops met the Republicans for the first time. Both Condé and Valenciennes were taken, and in August the Duke of York, at the head of 2,000 British cavalry, routed a French force, and drove it in disorder to the gates of Arras. The cavalry found several opportunities for distinction in these campaigns of the Duke of York, and, in particular, the charge of the 15th Light Dragoons at Villers-en-Cauchie in the following year was an exploit unsurpassed in its kind either in ancient or modern times. The skill shown by Lord Combermere as a cavalry officer in Spain may have been largely owing to the experience acquired on the plains of the north-east of France in his first campaigns. Like other officers who have afterwards borne part in great successes, he began with a thorough course of instruction in the art of how not to do it. The allies, having advanced as far as Marquion, between Arras and Cambrai, now held a council of war, of which the effect, although not the object, was to determine upon the plan of operations most likely to prevent the invaders from reaching Paris. Accordingly, it was resolved that the British force should act independently of the Austrians. The Duke of York was marching in a leisurely manner by way of Menin upon Dunkirk, when, on the 18th of August, a violent cannonade was heard in the direction of Lincelles. The Prince of Orange had attacked the French at this place, and got possession of it. The French in greater force returned, and drove out the Dutch. Major-General Lake, with three battalions of British Guards, was directed to retake the village. The French, meanwhile, had intrenched themselves, but the British attacked with a vigour that amazed them, and carried the intrenchments instantly with the bayonet. The French, making a second stand outside the village, were again attacked with the same impetuosity and routed. At the Guards' festival before-mentioned it was stated that their guest, Lord Combermere, although a cavalry officer, was present at this the most brilliant exploit of the campaign. It must be owned that the campaign itself was very far from brilliant, for the English Government, although it sacrificed the possibility of an advance on Paris for the sake of besieging Dunkirk, did not make proper arrangements to enable the Duke of York to take that place, and he was ultimately obliged to retreat, leaving his siege artillery behind, and having considerably jeopardized his army.

Next year the allies, in strong force, were still encamped on French soil, and pushing the siege of Landrecy, when Pichegru, who now commanded the French army, advanced to its relief. In the fighting which ensued, the British and Austrian cavalry did splendid service at Cateau, routing troops of every arm opposed to them. It is stated that the loss of the French in this battle was 4,000 men and 35 guns, while the British lost only about 150 men, and the Austrians a still smaller number. The future Lord Combermere shared in this, which was one of the most remarkable exploits of that branch of the service to which he belonged. Landrecy surrendered; but in the battle of Tourcoin, soon after, the allies mismanaged matters so that the British force narrowly escaped destruction, while other columns which should have co-operated with it remained inactive. Pichegru was at this time absent, and the vigour and ability with which the French troops were handled at Tourcoin was due principally to Moreau and Souham, who here laid the foundation of their fame. Among the Austrian officers engaged we find the distinguished names of the Archduke Charles, Schwarzenburg, and Kray, but, by that inevitable fatality which mars almost all Austrian campaigns, the

Emperor Francis was in supreme command. The only consolation for the disaster was that the Emperor acknowledged publicly that the Duke of York's column was the only one of five that completed the service expected of them. The Duke of York now took up a position in front of Tournay, and there his troops fought for fifteen hours with the French under Macdonald, whose name also became famous afterwards, and defeated them; but from want of combination among the allies this success was fruitless. We will not trace the course of disaster further. The allies were driven from the Netherlands, and afterwards from Holland. The remains of the British army embarked in the spring of 1795 at Bremen, having suffered grievous hardships in the preceding winter, and displayed throughout the war military qualities which only wanted competent generalship, and independence of the movements of allies, to achieve great success. The Duke of Wellington, as well as Lord Combermere, served in these campaigns, and both these officers doubtless drew from them many profitable lessons.

We next hear of Lord Combermere on widely different fields of action. He commanded the 25th Light Dragoons, who were employed at the conquest of the Cape of Good Hope in 1795, and afterwards were sent to India. This regiment formed part of the army collected in 1799 for the final conflict of British power with Tippoo Sahib. At Mallavelly, forty miles from Seringapatam, Tippoo encountered the advancing British, and, himself taking the initiative, attempted to push his cavalry between the brigades of infantry which were moving forward to attack him. The Asiatic horse charged the Europeans with great boldness, although without success; and here, also, Lord Combermere doubtless learned something which became useful afterwards. The duties of the siege of Seringapatam, which followed, fell chiefly on other branches of the army; but it is to be reckoned among the services of Lord Combermere that he assisted at the capture of the capital of Tippoo Sahib, one of the most formidable enemies that have disputed British supremacy in India. For some years Lord Combermere found no further opportunity for distinction; and, indeed, so far as regards European warfare, this country happily confined her enterprises chiefly to the sea, where she had learned to manage matters more skilfully than upon land, and where she was not dependent upon allies whose co-operation had often brought her into difficulty, while in their absence her small armies were liable to be overwhelmed. In Spain, where it has been said that a large army starves while a small army is likely to get beaten, the British found a field of action particularly suitable to their means and capacity, and hither was sent in a happy hour Lord Combermere, in command of a brigade of cavalry. The Duke of Wellington, who had sometimes a good deal of trouble with his cavalry and its officers, found in Sir Stapleton Cotton, as he was then called, a man whom he could wholly trust. The brilliant exploit of Villers-en-Cauchie was probably rather too often present to the minds of well-mounted and reckless soldiers taking their first gallop upon Spanish turf. "I suppose, sir," said Marshal Beresford, "if the gates of Badajoz had been open, you would have galloped in?" "You may be sartin of that, sir," answered a gallant Irishman, who had been leading his regiment in the style of the heroes of Lever's novels. This regiment had beaten a body of French cavalry and captured the guns escorted by it; but while it was galloping after the routed cavalry, the French artillery got into order and pursued its march, while the infantry rallied round it and carried the whole train safe into Badajoz. Latour-Maubourg, who commanded the French on this occasion, was a dashing leader of cavalry, but he was something more. Sir Stapleton Cotton also seems to have possessed this something, which was indispensable for a commander of British cavalry, opposed, as was the case almost always in the Peninsula, to far superior numbers of the enemy. The duty of looking on while hard fighting is done by infantry is a duty which the British cavalry soldier learns with extreme difficulty, and to his distaste for it may be ascribed more than one notable disaster, and particularly the Balaklava charge. At Talavera, where Sir Stapleton Cotton served, the different ways in which the duty of a cavalry officer may be performed were very strikingly displayed. A favourable opportunity of charging the French occurred, and a German and an English regiment advanced accordingly. But between them and the enemy opened a ravine, which was only discovered when they were close upon it. The German colonel, whom forty years' experience had made master of his art, pulled up on the brink, exclaiming, "I will not kill my young men." The English colonel dashed into the ravine, where many men were overthrown, and beyond it, where the residue encountered first the fire of squares of infantry, and, when quite exhausted, the sabres of cavalry beyond them. It may be judged, from the confidence placed in him by the Duke of Wellington, in which of these two ways Sir Stapleton Cotton performed his duty. He commanded at Fuentes d'Onor, where he had only 1,000 cavalry to oppose 2,500. The British retired from this unequal combat in good order across the plain, passing through the Light Division, which formed squares to receive the French cavalry. He was present at El Bodon, where three regiments of infantry, three squadrons of cavalry, and a few guns, were assailed by a French army. Wellington was here in a great strait, but the wonderful steadiness of his troops saved him. The conduct of the cavalry, who were Germans, was beyond all praise. The French cavalry, ten times as numerous, were striving to mount a hill on which the British stood. The Germans charged

the head of the column not once only, but twenty times, and long prevented it from establishing itself on the hill. There was in many small affairs more effort than went to the winning of considerable battles, and certainly Lord Combermere in all his long and varied service saw no harder fighting than at El Bodon. He commanded the British cavalry at Salamanca in that splendid charge which overthrew and trampled down 1,200 French infantry, and he pursued the routed enemy until two in the morning, when a voice challenged the head of the column with which he was riding, and a shot struck him on the wrist. The shot was fired by a Portuguese sentry in mistake. This wound seems to have disabled him for some time. He was not present at the battle of Vittoria, but at Orthez we read of General Cotton pouring down his cavalry upon the routed French. He also served at the battle of Toulouse.

Sir Stapleton Cotton of the Spanish war was raised to the peerage, as Baron Combermere, for his conspicuous services therein. He won the higher degree of viscount by the capture of Bhurtpore, when commanding-in-chief in India, in 1825-6. This was his last service in the field, and for forty years he enjoyed in peace the honours gained in Asiatic and European war. He held for many years the Colonelcy of the First Life Guards, and the rank of Field-Marshal was conferred upon him in 1855. He deserved and received the highest rewards of the successful soldier, and the regiment which had the honour to be commanded by him has lost a colonel who, in his day, understood how to handle cavalry as well as any man that ever crossed a horse. Lord Combermere began his military life under the old slow pedantic system which was swept away by the vehement genius of Napoleon. His natural life extended to a period when lessons learned under Napoleon had become obsolete. Looking to the great range now possessed by the weapons of infantry and artillery, it may be doubted whether the cavalry officer's occupation is not very nearly gone.

REVIEWS.

THE AMERICAN CONFLICT.*

MR. GREELEY says, fairly and truly, that it is impossible to write at present the history of the great American war and its causes; yet his own narrative, extending only to the close of 1861, contains 630 large octavo pages with double columns. His publishers announce, in a laudatory advertisement, that Mr. Greeley is qualified, above all his contemporaries, for the task which he has undertaken, and it may be admitted that, in a long and consistent public life, he has been familiarly acquainted with the course of American politics. It is difficult, however, for a journalist, especially if he has been the strong advocate of a party, to attain the calmness and comprehensive judgment which befit a historian. Although Mr. Greeley is honest and generally candid, his history often resembles in style and in purpose a magnified leading article. The exploits of General Butler, who is one of his special favourites, are commemorated in a tone of ironical complacency which seems to have been borrowed from the hero of the narrative. General Butler arrested a Mr. Kane, Police Marshal of Baltimore, "who, making all possible opposition to capture of arms designed for the rebels, was taken also to the Fort, that he might see that they were in safe hands." At Fortress Monroe, General Butler was so much cramped by the proximity and audacity of the rebels, that "he resolved on enlarging the circle of his Virginian acquaintance." The satirical passages of Mr. Dickens's later novels are not more gratuitously or feebly facetious. The occasional use of offensive cant phrases may also be attributed to habits of journalism. "Mr. Polk was already in Washington making up his jewels," or, in simple language, arranging his official nominations. It is still more difficult, as it is happily unnecessary, to guess the meaning of "a yard-stick clamour." As Mr. Greeley's manner is seldom equally vulgar, it would not be worth while to point out his defects of taste except as proofs and illustrations of the narrowness which diminishes the value of his judgment. Political slang is, for the most part, an expression or a caricature of disputed conclusions or assumptions. When it is used in serious discussion, it indicates prejudice, as well as a want of refinement. In other respects Mr. Greeley displays an unreserve which, in any country but his own, would scarcely be thought compatible either with justice or with dignity. He accuses General Paterson of treachery, as well as of incompetence, on account of his proceedings before the battle of Bull Run; and he broadly insinuates that General Scott himself was influenced in his military measures by a desire to connive at Secession. It was not to be expected that the editor of a principal New York paper should, even in an elaborate historical work, recognise the plainest doctrines of international law. Yet it is surprising to find the outrage on the *Trent* justified from the terms of the Queen's Proclamation, which, even if it had supported Mr. Greeley's argument, had no legal validity, except as a constructive admission on the part of the Government. English subjects were warned of the consequences of carrying "officers, soldiers, despatches, arms, or military stores;" and it is obvious, from the context, that only military or naval officers are included in the terms of the document. Mr. Greeley, however, gravely complains that the *Trent*

* *The American Conflict.* By Horace Greeley. New York.

"was carrying very important officers and despatches for the Confederates," because Mr. Mason and Mr. Slidell were diplomatic agents, while no despatches were found, or known to exist, on board the vessel. It might as well be said that a statute affecting the duties of general officers was binding on the Attorney-General. Mr. Greeley repeats the foolish pretence that the demand for the surrender of the captured passengers would have been more courteously and considerably preferred if the United States had not been involved in difficulties. The courtesy and temper of the English Government contrasted favourably with the ostentatious rudeness of the American House of Representatives, of the Secretary of the Navy, and of the Government and people of Massachusetts. Although Captain Wilkes had incurred no danger, he received extravagant public honours on the exclusive ground of his having offered an insult to the English flag. It is true that, as Mr. Greeley states, a majority of American publicists had discredited their judgment or their honesty by justifying an outrage which was unanimously condemned in every other civilized country.

Like most of his countrymen, Mr. Greeley denounces the educated classes of Englishmen as reactionary aristocrats, who especially fear and abhor the best characteristics of republican freedom:—

A New England town meeting [he says], wherein the shoemaker moves that 6,000 dollars be this year raised for the support of common schools, and is seconded by the blacksmith—neither of them worth perhaps the shop in which by daily labour he earns his daily bread—the waggon-maker moving to amend by raising the sum to 8,000 dollars, and the doctor making a five minutes' speech to show why this should or should not prevail—when the question is taken first on the amendment, then on the main proposition, either of them standing or falling as the majority of those present shall decide—such a spectacle is calculated to strike more terror to the soul of kingcraft than would the apparition of a score of speculating Rousseaus or fighting Garibaldis.

It is a pity that an able and benevolent man should indulge in mischievous and ill-natured declamation, when the most fragmentary acquaintance with English institutions and feelings would convince him that he is writing perverse nonsense. New England inherited its parish meetings from the Mother-country, where they still flourish in their original form. It is true that the farmers and tradesmen of an English vestry would object to the proposal of a grant of money by a shoemaker or by a duke who, according to Mr. Greeley's supposition, would be exempt from liability to the rate; but the amendment, the original motion, and the possible speech by the doctor are in strict accordance with the every-day practice of England. There is, indeed, no school-rate in consequence of sectarian dissensions, and consequently the clergy and others whom Mr. Greeley would include in his invective against aristocracy, or, as he oddly calls it, kingcraft, pay much more than their share of the cost of primary education. New England ratepayers are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves, and probably artisans without property have not really the power of taxing country townships. There is not the smallest ground for the assertion that Englishmen have regarded the orderly and legitimate working of American institutions with jealousy or dislike. That a Queen and a Parliamentary Minister are preferable to a President assisted by a board of Secretaries, is an opinion which may be held without offence, while a foreign country has a perfect right to maintain a contrary belief. It is not in New England villages, but in the great cities of the United States, that English politicians study, for their own instruction and warning, the effects of universal suffrage. It is notorious that in New York the taxes are imposed by the rabble, and that they are expended with scandalous profligacy by their nominees. The Republican party in the city is at this moment engaged in an attempt to reform the City Constitution, by withdrawing the power of taxation and the appointment to the civic offices from the untaxed multitude. It is publicly alleged that the extraordinary prevalence of crime in New York is attributable to the connivance of judges who, by the machinery of universal suffrage, are virtually appointed by the criminal classes. As every parish, every borough, and every city in England is a pure municipal republic, it is idle to identify a conscientious objection to promiscuous democracy with a selfish dislike to local or political freedom. The distaste which undoubtedly prevails in England for the results of American institutions applies mainly to the insolent disregard of the rights of other nations which has been inherited by the dominant Republicans from their Democratic opponents and predecessors.

Although Mr. Greeley neither is nor affects to be a neutral politician, his strong convictions are in some respects not unfavourable to an impartial estimate of the controversy which ended in Secession. It was impossible that he should exaggerate the encroaching and presumptuous spirit of the Southern champions of slavery, and he is not disposed to conceal or palliate the eager complicity of the Northern Democrats, or the timid subserviency of the earlier Republicans. No writer has shown more fully how the leaders of the South were gradually tempted and encouraged into a fatal and almost inexplicable mistake. The question of the right to the Territories had been decided in their favour by the Supreme Court; they had a majority in both Houses of Congress; and the election of a Republican President had been effected by their wilful connivance. It was highly probable that they might have retained for several years their accustomed control of the policy of the Union, but they were irritated by the growing strength of the Opposition; and they were prepared to prove, from innumerable admissions of their

Northern supporters, that Secession might be accomplished without a possibility of resistance, although all the popular statesmen of former times, as well as the recent rulers of the Republic, had countenanced the theory of the inherent sovereignty of the States, and had impressed on their countrymen, as the most sacred of duties, a scrupulous reverence for the institution of slavery. The moderate Republicans had habitually protested their innocence of the charge of unconstitutional interference, and the Abolitionists, assuming that slavery was invulnerable in the South, had openly avowed their desire for a dissolution of the Union. If all parties had been verbally consistent, the Slave States would have been allowed to secede in peace; and the Southern leaders rashly took both friends and enemies at their word. Their extravagant reliance on the value of popular commonplaces may be partially excused by the universal prevalence of the same illusion. After the election of Mr. Lincoln, eminent Republican politicians were anxious only that the division should coincide with the border of the Free States, as it was thought probable that large districts of Pennsylvania and New York might prefer to share the fortunes of the South. Lord Macaulay has ridiculed, in a well-known passage, the credulity of James II. in assuming that Royalists and Churchmen would practise at their own expense the passive obedience and non-resistance which they had preached to malcontent Puritans. It is perhaps scarcely possible to distrust the professions of natural antagonists when they tender a voluntary submission. The promoters of Secession were as blind as the last of the Stuarts, but the parallel holds no farther. Instead of tamely recoiling in the face of unexpected resistance, they have, to the utmost of their material power, made good by their valour and fortitude the miscalculations of their policy; and they have substituted for the fanciful or trivial grievances which formed the original pretext of their quarrel a practical assertion of the right of a great and heroic community to form an independent nation.

It would have been useless and unjust to complain too loudly of the disappointment of unfounded hopes. The Democrats and many of the Republicans had been willing to pay an extravagant price for the peaceable maintenance of the Union, but the scornful and final rejection of their overtures left them at liberty to retract their previous concessions. It was not from love of slavery that the extension of the system had been promoted by successive Legislatures and Governments. The seizure of Texas, the project of acquiring Cuba, the Dred Scott decision, were intended by the North as extravagant bribes, and they were accepted by the South as instalments of a debt. It might be logical to argue that the object for which so many crimes had been committed must be of transcendent and paramount importance, but it was only as the supposed condition of national unity that slavery had been worshipped in the Free States. Hypocritical idolatry is subject to rapid collapse when motives of interest no longer operate. The Abolitionists, who at the beginning of the war were despised as an insignificant faction, now probably constitute the most powerful party in the North. The large minority which voted in the autumn of 1864 for McClellan is disposed to tolerate slavery only because it is thought that an acknowledgment of State rights might still conciliate and reclaim the South. The same passionate blindness which had led the partisans of slavery to try a ruinous experiment has since obliterated from the memory of Northern politicians both the excuses which palliated the imprudence of Secession and the doubts of foreign Governments whether the disruption deserved to be stigmatized as rebellion. Every nation is bound by the public acts and declarations of its constituted authorities, and successive Presidents and Legislatures had repeatedly denounced the encroachments of the North as intolerable acts of injustice. In the autumn of 1860, on the eve of the Secession, the Federal Senate after full debate resolved, by a majority of nearly two to one, that the Sovereign States had delegated only a portion of their powers to Congress, and that any unconstitutional interference with their rights would render the maintenance of the Union impossible. About the same time, Mr. Buchanan, in his last message to Congress, after discussing the power of the Federal Government to prevent Secession by force, deliberately concluded that no such authority was provided by the Constitution, and his opinion provoked no comment in either branch of Congress. Mr. Lincoln himself repeatedly expressed his determination not to invade the Southern States, and his defeated rival, Mr. Douglas, approved the President's inaugural speech on the express ground that it might be interpreted as repudiating the doctrine of coercion. The entire Democratic party, which still commanded a majority in the Free States, held that the employment of armed force would be more criminal than Secession; nor were the Republicans themselves prepared to adopt active measures before the bombardment of Fort Sumter. Mr. Greeley, with praiseworthy candour, reprints from the *Tribune* an article of his own, in which he proposed that, if the Slave States deliberately resolved on Secession, they should be allowed to depart in peace. General Scott, the Commander-in-chief, openly avowed the same opinion, and the subsequent revolution of feeling took the American population, as well as the outer world, by surprise. During the earlier part of the crisis the zealous Federalists of the English *Morning Star* selected, as their favourite topic of eulogy and of national envy, the Republican wisdom which had allowed a great revolution to be accomplished without shedding a single drop of blood. The monarchies of the Old World, it was said, with their prejudices and standing armies, would have at once plunged into the crime of civil war, while the American Free States only

regretted a delusion which had produced an untimely exercise of the inherent right of revolution.

The inconsistency of the Northern Americans was far more excusable than the imitative caprice of their fanatical partisans in England. After an interval of paralysing astonishment, the Free States instinctively felt that it was unworthy of a great nation to submit in silence to a sentence of dissolution. The low organization of Spanish America might permit the alternate union and separation of neighbouring States; but the Northern Republic could not tamely abandon all its hopes of greatness and supremacy. The advocates of Secession had justified their departure from the Union, sometimes by arguments founded on the text of the Constitution, and more frequently by the supposed right of revolution, which had, since the time of the first rebellion, formed a part of the political creed of the United States. When the North, after recovering from its stupor, had determined to assert the national unity by arms, it was easy to show that no Constitution had ever provided for its own destruction; and practical experience suggested that, in the New World as in the Old, the right of revolution meant only the right of appealing to the arbitrament of force. As soon as the first shot was fired in the harbour of Charleston, both litigants joined issue in the form which alone could decide the vital controversy. The South, now strengthened by the adhesion of Virginia, of North Carolina, of Arkansas, and of Tennessee, had the same right to assert its independence which had belonged to the thirteen colonies in 1776; and the Government of Washington had the same right with George III. to suppress the rebellion by arms. In the four years which have since elapsed, the Confederates have emulated the heroism of Marathon and Thermopylae, while their enemies have displayed the pertinacity, the power of organization, and the patriotic love of empire which created the greatness of Rome. The commencement of the strife was as the letting out of water, but it was impossible to anticipate the volume and the pressure of the flood. The contest now belongs to the domain of history rather than of ethics, although Mr. Greeley is anxious, as a moralist, to prove that his antagonists were originally in the wrong. On the assumption that the system of slavery is inherently criminal, he has little difficulty in proving that the Slave States were guilty of usurpation, and their Northern supporters of weak and culpable complicity. The legal questions which have been superseded by the war were not equally simple.

The common statement that the quarrel related to the extension of slavery to the Territories requires some correction or explanation. The Republican minority, indeed, which had elected Mr. Lincoln, insisted that slavery in the Territories should be prohibited by Congress; but the dominant Democracy was divided only on the question whether the settlers should select their own institutions, or whether slavery was already established in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution. But for this dispute, a Democratic President would have been elected in 1860, and the revolution would have been avoided or postponed. The Supreme Court had confirmed the extreme pretensions of the South, and the election of Mr. Lincoln was dangerous to the slave-owners only because he might have filled up vacancies on the Bench with Republican partisans. Much may be said for Mr. Greeley's theory that slavery, existing only by the laws of the several States, became invalid as soon as it transcended their limits. The Pro-slavery party, on the other hand, contended, with equal plausibility, that as the Territories were common to all the States, every kind of property which was recognised in the Constitution was entitled to Federal protection in the joint domain. By the Missouri Compromise of 1820 it had been agreed that all States north of 36° 50' should be exempt from slavery; and the South would have agreed to apply the same rule to the Territories if their own section had been exclusively appropriated to slavery. The piratical acquisition of Texas and of other Mexican provinces, long after the admission of Missouri to the Union, had largely affected the importance of the controversy. When the South claimed the extension of the frontier of 1820 from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific, the Free States naturally drew back. It was chiefly for the purpose of extending slavery that Mexico had been plundered, and, with the same object, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Buchanan already threatened Spain with the seizure of Cuba. The Republicans, as their later history has proved, were by no means averse to lawlessness and arrogance in foreign policy; but they were not prepared to acquiesce in the continued supremacy of the Southern Democrats at home. The growing population of the North-West ensured them the possession of a majority at no distant period. The discreditable decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott, and the support afforded by Mr. Buchanan to the Missouri Border Ruffians in Kansas, had caused profound irritation throughout the North.

On the other hand, the Southern States were startled and alarmed by the extraordinary enterprise of the strange fanatic, John Brown, which furnishes Mr. Greeley with one of the most interesting chapters of his work. The elderly Puritan farmer who, disliking politics and military service, coolly organized a revolutionary war of his own, seems to belong rather to romance than to history. John Brown was between fifty and sixty when he went to Kansas to fight the Missouri Border Ruffians; and a short experience of irregular warfare seems to have fascinated his imagination, while his new-born and unsuspected pugnacity easily amalgamated itself with his religious and philanthropic convictions. It was not his fault that there was no law in Kansas, but in two or three years he forgot that law existed else-

where. The accounts of his skirmishes in the West are spirited and highly entertaining, especially as the rough and unreasoning partisan was not without a sense of humour. On one occasion he kept a prisoner, who was inclined to use profane language, in custody for several days, compelling him to go through a form of prayer night and morning with a pistol at his head. On the return of the unwilling convert to his comrades, his complaints were received with such peals of laughter that he was obliged to remove to another district. Finding that his exploits had rendered it impossible for him to remain in Kansas, John Brown made his way North with his family, accompanied by some runaway negroes mounted on horses which he had captured from his enemies. During a short stay in Canada he drew up a remarkable document, called a Provisional Constitution, by which he adjudged all the property of slaveowners to himself and his associates as lawful spoils of war. A few weeks afterwards, having accumulated a stock of arms in a lonely house on the Virginian side of the Potomac, he seized the arsenal at Harper's Ferry, and, after a gallant resistance, he was taken prisoner, tried, and executed. Notwithstanding the language of his Provisional Constitution, he asserted, with unconscious inconsistency, that he had never meditated treason, and that he intended only to assist slaves to escape from their masters. The Virginians, to their credit, did full justice to his courage and to his blundering honesty; but the whole of the South attributed to the Republicans, and especially to the Abolitionists, the first overt act of civil war. As the assault on Mr. Sumner had tended to unite the Anti-Slavery party in the North, the attack on Harper's Ferry precipitated the division between the Northern and Southern Democrats, and it was therefore one of the causes of the election of Mr. Lincoln, of the Secession, and the war. At a later period, the half-mad single-minded adventurer was promoted to the honours of popular canonization, and probably in the Federal camps "his soul is still marching on."

Although Mr. Greeley is, within the limits of his judgment, a sincere and upright man, he has not succeeded in escaping from the influence of party prejudices. His narrative proves with superfluous demonstration that, while the supporters of slavery determined the national policy, the American Government failed to protect the minority, and that it disregarded with cynical audacity the rights and feelings of foreign States. When the people of Missouri, crossing the border of Kansas, drove the electors from the poll-booths, and established by their own spurious votes a pro-slavery Constitution, fenced round by extravagant penal laws, European observers saw with astonishment that the Federal Government, with the support of the Democratic majority, took the part of the aggressors against the victims. During the war of the Spanish Colonies against the Mother-country, the United States forbade the insurgents to interfere with Cuba, because the Government would not allow the abolition of slavery in the neighbourhood of Federal territory. An American officer, under the orders of General Jackson, invaded the Spanish province of Florida in time of profound peace, on the pretext that fugitive negroes had been received after crossing the border. Texas was detached by American adventurers from Mexico, and immediately recognised as an independent State by the Federal Government, and within a year or two it was annexed to the United States, and Mexico was wantonly attacked and further dismembered. Mr. Calhoun, then Secretary of State, solicited the support of France, in an elaborate despatch, on the ground that it was the common interest of all rival Powers to counteract the abolitionist policy of England. At a later period, Mr. Buchanan, as Minister at the English Court, was instructed by Mr. Pierce to concert with two of his colleagues a scheme for the acquisition of Cuba. Mr. Everett had, two years before, refused to join the French and English Governments in a guarantee of Cuba to Spain, and he had volunteered to state that his Government entertained no designs on the island. The Buchanan memorandum on Cuba is justly characterized by Mr. Greeley as an unprecedented act of coarseness and insolent cupidity. He also remarks that not one of the freebooters who had invaded Cuba from New Orleans was ever punished or molested by the Democratic Government. All these outrages were perpetrated in the interest of slavery, but the principle, or absence of principle, which they exhibited was not to be attributed to the immediate motive of action.

The Democrats countenanced the usurpation of the suffrage of Kansas by the Missouri Border Ruffians; but the Republicans organized sham Constitutions in Louisiana and Florida for the factious purpose of insuring the election of their candidate for the Presidency, and it was only when Mr. Lincoln's success was secured that they confessed their irregularity by rejecting the fraudulent votes. The same party, in a packed Convention in Tennessee, has lately abolished slavery without compensation, in notorious defiance of the opinions of the majority of the citizens of the State. The military Governor of the same State, now Vice-President elect of the United States, imposed on the voters at the Presidential election a test so utterly illegal that Tennessee also is excluded by Congress from the list of States sharing in the election. General Dix's order for the invasion of Canada offers an exact parallel to General Jackson's invasion of Florida, although, happily for the peace of the world, the crime which was recently meditated has not been actually committed. Mr. Seward's Brazilian despatch is incomparably more lawless than Mr. Calhoun's appeal to the jealousy of France. The annexation of Canada has not yet been proposed, like the seizure of Cuba, in an

official document, although it supplies almost all Northern journalists with their most popular topic. Mr. Greeley is too honest to acquit his countrymen of responsibility for the language of their newspaper press; and he must be aware that some public writers have renewed the project of annexing Cuba, for the purpose, not of extending, but of abolishing slavery. Even if the St. Albans marauders had been protected by the Canadian authorities, the contempt for international right would have had a precedent in the indemnity of Walker and of the accomplices of Lopez. The Republicans, like the Democrats, have been educated in a fabulous history, and habituated to extravagant boasting, until they have persuaded themselves that they are exempted from political necessities and from moral restraints. Their writers and speakers constantly appeal to the will of the people as the highest authority even in disputes with foreign nations. Their most popular statesmen repudiate, like Mr. Seward, the plainest obligations of public law; and Mr. Greeley himself, though he is a conscientious and benevolent man, considers a verbal metaphor a sufficient excuse for an armed violation of English neutrality. There is, however, reason to believe that the President is honestest than General Jackson, than Mr. Polk, than Mr. Pierce, or Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Greeley never did better service to his country than when he induced the Chicago Convention of 1860 to prefer Mr. Lincoln, as the candidate of the party, to his present Secretary of State.

FRENCH NOVELISTS.*

SOMETHING more than the satisfaction of curiosity may come from an acquaintance with the lives of great writers. Since scarcely a single author whose works are in existence has possessed a power so absolutely dramatic as to be able to show in his writings no trace of his individual character, the converse of the fact may be fairly assumed as true. That is to say, as the works show something of the man, the history of the man must similarly throw light on his works. There are two ways in which such history will chiefly be useful. In the first place, some knowledge of the kind is likely to debar us from too hasty generalizations. There are people who speak of German theology, or of French fiction, as if, for purposes of classification, whole nations were in the habit of adopting in their published works a uniformity which no one could ever think of attributing to their characters. A certain set of reflections, and a few tricks of style, will no doubt constantly recur in the literature of a country, for months or even years, whenever an influential writer has happened to fix his mark on a large number of his contemporaries. But the more we consider these, the more we shall be struck with the superficial character of their resemblance; and the dissimilarity is greater in proportion as we rise to the more powerful thinkers or writers of the time. What everybody is saying is precisely that which the greatest men forbear to say. Such a phenomenon as that of the Lake School of poets, when writers professedly adopted a kind of partnership of taste, and actually prided themselves on thinking and speaking alike, is due to a very exceptional state of feeling, and is a phenomenon far from likely to recur. It will be always a safeguard against the indolent habit of too broadly classifying any literature to have some acquaintance with the lives of the authors themselves, to understand something of the influences under which they grew up, and the incidents which shaped their careers. On the other hand, there is the opposite, though minor, danger of regarding the works of any one author as a solid whole, self-contained and self-interpreting. We should think very differently about Dryden if we knew nothing of the man and his times, and our estimate of Euripides might be very decidedly corrected if we had his personal and literary history to guide us in forming a judgment. There is a fair amount of socialism, after all, in the republic of letters, and to the community of ideas which its citizens enjoy the richest, as is but just, contribute most.

A "school" of writers is, then, a significant, though a dangerous, expression. Literary schools neither keep together, like a shoal of whales, nor are indoctrinated by the same teachers, like a school of boys. It may be useful to consider exactly how far such a term as that of the "French school of fiction" has any true meaning, and how far it implies the contrary of truth. How far have French novelists any essential resemblance to one another, beyond that which may be inferred from their habit of printing paragraphs each one sentence long? How far do they look at things in the same way? or, if the expression seems too vague, how far do they describe men and women with any common notions of art and common social sympathies? To examine the question as it deserves, it is necessary to go back to a time some sixty or seventy years ago. One of the prominent evils of war is that it throws the arts of peace into the shade. The events of the great struggle with which this century opened have even now so dazzling an effect that it is with some surprise that we begin at last to remember that there were other things besides victories going on in the world at the same time. It was not only on Napoleon that the thoughts of the French people were directed, even at the time of his most brilliant feats of arms. There were two distinct intellectual movements in progress during the period of the Consulate, similar indeed to one another, but of different origin; and neither of them may be safely neglected by the histo-

rian, however superior in scenes of exciting adventure the Egyptian campaign may be. The first of these movements was what we may call the Romantic reaction of the end of the last century. The protest against the minute analysis of Kant was not confined to schools of philosophy and theology, which made themselves heard loudly enough. Even in the domain of art and of fiction, there were many who found it impossible to separate their inner selves into a believing and an unbelieving half, and who took the step, not unprecedented in logic, of adopting enthusiasm as a substitute for dialectical results. They set up an idol, æsthetic or historical, and called upon their associates to fall down and worship it, on the ground that there the idol was. After all, those only can afford to despise the popularity of Novalis and the Schlegels who believe, as so few people do, in the satisfying character of logical reasoning. Fouqué delighted the world with Undine; and, strange to say, the delight was not confined to those who affirmed the existence of water-sprites. When Tieck translated the *Tempest*, it was as if a new sense was being restored to Germany. There was something to ease for, it seemed, after all; it was possible to rebel in reason and yet bow in spirit; a new humility, the offspring of a grand ideal, was disclosed to minds that sorely needed something in human nature to depend upon; it was no longer unfashionable to chaunt a battle-song of Körner, or go into raptures over a statue of Canova. This movement spread from Germany to France; Augustus Schlegel and Madame de Staël were its chief apostles. The university of Jena was the cynosure of thought and feeling to many zealous students in France who quailed before the practical irony, while they clung to the refined idealism, of Goethe.

Strong was the revolt against the dialectics of Germany, but stronger still was that against the materialism of the school of Condillac. It was rather a victory than a reaction; and a victory so decided that historians, seeing little of the struggle, for the most part think too little of the result. Hardly had the violent scenes of the Revolution passed away, when the excitement of literary controversy renewed itself. Mysticism is suited, as experience shows, to times of change and tumult, and few names were more loudly heard in the din of civil strife than those of Swedenborg and Boehme. But it was not mysticism that gave its fervour to the French revival of belief. The same crowds who but lately had thronged to read the edicts of the Convention now pressed with equal zeal to hear Saint-Martin discuss the origin of ideas, or De Maistre lecture on the moral sense. The extraordinary rapidity with which, on the establishment of the Concordat, the old worship was revived throughout the empire, is a fact of great significance. The principles of the Revolution remained, but they were adapted to a moral and spiritual creed the very reverse of that which the actors in the Revolution had promulgated. The old wine was put into new bottles, and the fact that neither of them perished is one of the most singular that the history of the period can produce. It seemed for a time as if Chateaubriand would carry everything before him. To proclaim the ideal was the only philosophy; to uphold the romantic the only literary art. So ran the tide for some years; and the Government rejoiced. Then came as great a struggle as ever; for the new philosophy was brought into close contact, if not into actual collision, with a power stronger than philosophy. Once more there arose in France—with theories better moulded than before, and principles better tested—the great engrossing questions of political and social life.

Such a contest as this it is which is reflected in the pages of *Les Misérables*; such a struggle as this it was which tore the heart of Lamennais. Scepticism was no longer the dominant chord in French thought; in times so stirring there seemed to be little leisure for absolute disbelief. The worship of the ideal was established in all the ways of men; to be a doctrinaire was a surer passport to favour than to be a satirist. Enjolras led applauding hundreds in his train where Grantaire but commanded the units. But the intense feeling of political dissatisfaction had turned such thoughts in a new direction. What, it was felt, if this ideal be a thing within one's reach? What if, in order to compass the happiness, the completion, the absolute good of which we dream, it be necessary not to think, but to act? The experiment of the Restoration had left the fabric of civil society more rotten and tottering than it had found it. Was it to the divine authority of a Church, as Chateaubriand declared, or to the supreme sovereignty of the people, that the longing eyes of desperate men were to turn? Fourierism, St. Simonism—all those visions grow more plain and almost tangible to the grasp which, from time to time, charm an excited people into an almost millennial hope. Thirty years before, the nation had been roused by oppression; now it was maddened by the weariness of delay. With disappointment, restlessness, self-blame, self-questioning, were yet associated the generous earnestness, the romantic belief in the future, which gilds even a crusade for common goods, or a scheme for fraternity of labour. Above all, it was felt, let the change come from within and not from without. The new era was to be ushered in, if fate willed it, by fire and sword; but that society needed urgently some reform, and that it contained within itself all the materials necessary for its renovation, were the two ideas which beyond all others swayed the minds of men in Paris in the early years of Louis-Philippe.

Happily for the public, it is possible for men to feel alike and yet write very differently. It seems at first sight almost a paradox to declare that Louis Blanc and Lamartine were actuated by similar feelings. And yet the more we examine them the

* *French Authors at Home.* Episodes in the Lives and Works of Balzac, Madame de Girardin, George Sand, &c. By the Author of "Heroes, Philosophers, and Courtiers of the Times of Louis XVI." &c. London: Booth, 1864.

more they seem to approximate to the type of sentiment of which we have been speaking. Both were dreamers, as was Beranger in his best moments, of earnest and passionate dreams; both seeking, in their different ways, to get at the heart of the movement of modern society, and carry it out to its perfect end. Both were observers of human nature and its laws, however discordant their conclusions; both were full of some poetry of life, and thorough believers in the possibility of reforming the civilization of the day on *à priori* principles. It is not on these men, however, that we should fix if we wished to see embodied in one single writer the strength and the foibles, the ambition and the discontent, of modern France. The most popular writer of his country, the most versatile writer of the age, Victor Hugo, is to English eyes the best representative of the literature of Paris. "French fiction," if there is such a thing, must be referred to him more conspicuously than to any of his contemporaries. What, then, are the characteristics of his art? He is bold, rapid, ideal; he is more vividly rhetorical than any other living author; he is poetic, as becomes the author of the *Légende des Siècles* and the lyrics so dear to Frenchmen; he is self-conscious, egotistical; with romantic views, as they used to be called, of art, and views more romantic still of truth; believing largely in noble thoughts, and little in empirical knowledge. An enemy would call his work meretricious; a friend would claim some wilfulness of colouring as essential to the highest art. The critic might urge that he is untrue to life; the poet would claim him as a hero in proportion as his ideas transcend life. True, he did not take the same view of Cromwell as most other historians; but neither would he have looked with the same eyes on the twelve hundred thousand Parisians among whom he lived. The writer who derived his earliest inspiration from Lamartine might well be unfaithful to Guizot.

Victor Hugo thus represents the principles of the Revolution, modified by the Romantic revival of the early Empire, and largely coloured again by the restless political eagerness which the restored Monarchy by its restored abuses engendered. So the training took effect on a daring and mobile intellect. Let us now look at the same ideas as they appear when reflected in a different type of mind, shaped by a very different education. A convent; a few glimpses of a stirring life; a convent again; a short trial of the old feudalism that still lingered here and there in the provinces of France; an unhappy marriage; a solitary campaign in the capital against hunger, neglect, and friendlessness—such were the scenes among which the genius of George Sand was moulded, stunted, urged. All the fancies that could rise to the mind of one who had made companions of the saints and martyrs; the wilfulness of one against whom society had done its worst; the loftiness of a Lamartine; the self-absorption, self-possession, of a Charlotte Brontë—these are what she had to draw upon. Picture such a mind as this brought face to face with the new creed of Paris, that creed which so earnestly hoped in the future and so distrusted the present—which so resented the unwillingness of society to reform itself, and so steadfastly refused to admit any reforming elements from without—which spent its years in hoping for a Messiah of socialism, and no Messiah came. What happened? Her idealism grew more passionate, her fretfulness more morose than before, her disregard of opinion more reckless, her love for beauty and for nature more selfish. She wrote as one who feels that all that she says is out of tune with what she most believes. She paints the tyranny of social laws, and at the same time proclaims the weakness of laws to cramp the will; she crowns passion as the goddess of life, and almost in the same page is vehement in asserting the doctrines of material progress. At one moment human beings with her are swept along in a torrent of necessity, with no guide but instinct, and no worship but nature; at the next, a life in the meadows, with the sacredness of family ties and the recurring charm of the seasons, is the highest ideal she can picture. It is a mind powerful even in its most untrue moments, powerful even when most thrown off its balance by the contradictions of a too exciting career. It is essentially unpolitical; it is more than ordinarily illogical. It is the Renaissance of positive belief under the form which it must assume in an intellect which can only display its ideal side, which is too untrained and too inconsequent to receive the impression of its critical and solid strength.

Last—unlike the rest, and yet with something in common with them—is Balzac. What effect did the current of French thought produce in him? It might be said, by one who judged hastily, that it produced none at all. For Balzac was a "genius"—a genius in the commonest and vulgar sense of the term; a clever man, that is, who liked to be odd, and did not mind what people thought of him. Far less likely to be acted upon by others than to act upon them, he was a man isolated in mind, as, for the most part, in life. Yet there is one side of the philosophy of modern France from which it is impossible to separate what we know of Balzac, so fully is it represented in all the more characteristic of his works. We have spoken of the trust in human nature and human destinies which seems to have acted almost as a revival of belief in minds prepared for it by the revulsions of the days succeeding the great Revolution. But we have pointed out carefully the self-reliant, introspective character of this belief; it was idealistic in form, but deliberate and positive in essence. This it seems to have been which formed the mind of Balzac; which led it to the painstaking accuracy, the cold—one might almost say the frozen—irony which signalize every word he wrote. Balzac is the most sceptical of writers. No living man ever set himself more steadfastly to ignore what are popularly called lofty ideas. He studied men and women as if his whole soul was bent on

searching through and through their characters, realizing every light and shadow, probing every weakness, and analysing every force. With the same enthusiasm which other men reserve for their ideas, he throws himself into his anatomy of character. He brought to it no ordinary power. Frenchmen hardly knew whether to wonder most at the strange things he had to say, or the strangeness of the way he learnt them. He painted every society and every class, and yet he hardly moved beyond his circle of private friends. His own life was temperate, and yet he describes scenes of revelry and license as from a photograph. And he never made a mistake, and never shirked a difficult corner in the canvas he had to fill. Perhaps this power is necessarily attached to scepticism such as his. The vision which of set purpose limits itself to a certain range is likely to prove marvellously clear within it. And it was in virtue of this power that he marked himself off so distinctly from his contemporaries. One might almost say that it became impossible to him to write untruthfully. Compare the *Peau de Chagrin* with one of George Sand's romances. In the latter, all that is described may quite well have taken place, but the events seem all to be placed in a region distant from that of ordinary life. No one can for a moment suppose that they can have so occurred to any one that they know. In the former, the things told are clearly impossible; but it is only our conviction that they are certainly impossible that prevents us from affirming that they must have happened exactly as they are told.

If we have at all succeeded in describing what seems to us to be the leading ideas in the works of these novelists, it will not be difficult to answer the original question with which we started. Is there, properly speaking, such a thing as a French school of fiction? There is as much a French school of fiction as there is a French school of everything else. A home-staying nation is more homogeneous than a travelling one, and ideas at Paris embody themselves more fully and immediately in the general literature of the day than in London. We have indicated some grounds for thinking that the period of the restored monarchy in France was a period of a very remarkable intellectual action. The traces of this action, many-sided as it was, may no doubt be seen in the drama and the poetry of the time. We have considered it at present, however, almost entirely as it appears in the domain of fiction. We have seen that one phase of it colours very largely the dissimilar writings of Victor Hugo and George Sand. We have suggested that another phase may fairly be considered as represented in the unique pages of Balzac. Between these writers there is all the world of difference which contrasted personal characters can interpose. To connect them there is just so much resemblance as the opposite poles of the same philosophy may engender. Writers of the same "school" are like a number of coins of the same reign placed side by side. Different in metal, in value, and in size, they are yet alike in form and feature. The great French novelists of late years are rather like the opposite sides of the same coin. The metal that we see is the same, though with varieties of light and shadow; the impressed effigy alone is dissimilar in all its parts.

At the head of these remarks we have placed the title of a book to which we ought perhaps to apologize for having so entirely neglected to refer. But it is a book which it is quite impossible to review. It is anonymous; it is unaccredited; and it gives no authorities for its facts. If there are any persons who are fond of reading some gossiping talk about distinguished persons, slightly free at times, but written with moderate fluency, and who are not very particular about the accuracy of the information they pick up, they may very possibly study the volumes before us with interest, if not with profit.

WELD'S LAST WINTER IN ROME.*

ON first opening Mr. Weld's book by chance at page 313, we found him calling Sunday the Sabbath-day, even in translating from an Italian publication. Considering that "*Sabbato*" happens to be the Italian for Saturday, this adoption of the Puritan term struck us as ominous. Turning then, by another chance, to his concluding paragraphs, we found him exclaiming "But see, morn dawns!" in describing a simple journey over Mont Cenis. Putting these small indications together, there rose before us a vision of some six hundred pages of florid evangelicalism to be painfully mastered—a task sufficiently depressing to the most seasoned critic. We are bound to say that the disagreeable vision was speedily dissipated. A more pleasant, instructive, and intelligent book, in the nature of travels, we have not encountered for some time past. Such failings as must be attributed to Mr. Weld are chiefly of the small and verbal kind already indicated. Such as they are, however, they are surprising in a man of so much cultivation and observation. Indeed, his blunders in spelling and quoting any language but his own are astonishing, while now and then he makes havoc even with his English grammar. What shall we say to a man who tells us that on the Feast of the Epiphany the little children "declaim *piccolo sermonetias*," and that Constantine IV. was nicknamed *Copronymous*, who talks of the "*Collegio di Propaganda Fide*," of the "*Clivus Cinice*," and of the Hospital of the *Santissima Salvatore*? After this it seems hardly worth noting that the very excellent man and very bad composer, Liszt, should have his name turned into List. But if it is difficult to account for this marvellous scorn of grammar in a mature and well-educated gentleman, what is to be said to the following, as an

* *Last Winter in Rome*. By Charles Richard Weld. London: Longman & Co. 1865.

example of utter and absolute no-meaning? Professing to reproduce the opinion of Mr. Hay, he informs us that "the colonnade of the Parthenon bears the same relation to a right angle that the musical ratio of one-fifth bears to the fundamental note." This, we take it, in its way is unrivalled. The vacuum is complete.

Notwithstanding, however, the havoc that Mr. Weld makes with the ancient and modern tongues of Italy, he is just the man to enjoy the manifold wonders of the Eternal City. And such men are few. The mere devout Catholic is certainly not the person to comprehend and revel in its wonders. Whether Italian or foreign, whether a born Catholic or a convert, he is rarely anything better than a clerical partisan, absorbed in the ceremonial and system of the Church of the present, hating or despising, but not comprehending, the mighty paganism amidst whose relics he treads, and valuing Christian and modern art simply as so much material out of which to construct fresh glorifications of the existing Ultramontaniam. To the mere artist again, Rome, as a mighty power of the past and a living power still, is little more than a name. The mere philosopher, too, who lives in the ages gone by, and smiles unsympathetically at the superstition around him, misses the mysterious hidden life which still vivifies the seemingly dying world of Rome. But, of all classes, the ultra-Protestant controversialist or scornor is perhaps the most utterly blind to the story that these records of the unbroken life of five-and-twenty centuries have to tell. Mr. Weld, on the contrary, is just enough of the philosopher, the good Christian, the antiquarian, and the man of science to sympathize in various degrees with nearly every special characteristic of Rome. Art is perhaps his weak point; but a man cannot be everything. Though a stout Protestant, he comprehends the Roman *idea* of religious worship, and, wherever his personal opinions are not rudely shocked, enters into the spirit of what he sees. He even confesses to a belief in the principle of the "veneration" of relics, saying that, if he could bring himself to believe that the nail which he brought from the Church of Santa Croce was "a facsimile of one of those that pierced our Lord Jesus Christ, he should venerate it, and the more so on account of its having touched the true nail." Of course he could not convince himself of the authenticity of the supposed original. In fact, nothing proves more forcibly the ignorance of the Roman clergy, in all matters of historical criticism, than the amazing simplicity with which nearly all their ablest men believe in the reality of their multitudinous relics. The honesty with which Mr. Weld avows this very unheretical feeling lends all the more weight to his stories of the preposterous belief in miraculous images and marvels of all sorts and kinds which, in Catholic countries, is the counterpart to the ludicrous secular superstitions cherished by our English poor. We say "our English poor," though the spirit that believes in winking Madonnas and liquifying blood is still prevalent among us in the very last quarters where it would be looked for. The following, told by Mr. Weld, will surprise many readers; but we could mention the names of other living men, well known to fame, who have shown themselves as utterly incapable of comprehending the laws of evidence, when the supposed supernatural is in question, as the author of *Vanity Fair*. The first sentence should also be noted, as a specimen of Mr. Weld's slipshod English. Of course his meaning is that men of education *imagine* themselves favoured by spiritual manifestations:—

Nothing [he says] is more surprising than the manner in which persons of education and keen perception are either deluded by the tricks of jugglers, or are favoured by real spiritual manifestations. I remember well meeting the late Mr. Thackeray at a large dinner-party, shortly after the publication in the *Cornhill Magazine*, then edited by him, of the paper entitled "Stranger than Fiction." In this paper, as will be remembered by many readers, a detailed account was given of a spiritual *séance*, at which Mr. Home performed, or caused to be performed, many surprising things, the most astounding being his floating in the air above the heads of persons in the room. There were several scientific men at the dinner-party, all of whom availed themselves of the earliest opportunity to reproach Mr. Thackeray with having permitted the paper in question to appear in a periodical of which he was editor—holding, as he did, the highest rank in the world of letters. Mr. Thackeray, with that imperturbable calmness which he could so well assume, heard all that was said against him and the paper in question, and thus replied:—"It is all very well for you, who have probably never seen spiritual manifestations, to talk as you do; but, had you seen what I have witnessed, you would hold a different opinion." He then proceeded to inform us that, when he was in New York at a dinner-party, he saw the large and heavy dinner-table, covered with decanters, glasses, dishes, plates—in short, everything appertaining to dessert—rise fully two feet from the ground, the *modus operandi* being, as he alleged, spiritual force. No possible jugglery, he declared, was or could have been employed on the occasion; and he felt so convinced that the motive-force was supernatural, that he then and there gave in his adhesion to the truth of spiritualism, and consequently accepted the article on Mr. Home's *séance*. Whether Mr. Thackeray thought differently before he died, I cannot say; but this I know, that every possible argument was used by those present to endeavour to shake his faith in Mr. Home's spiritual manifestations, which were, as they declared, after all but sorry performances compared to the surprising tricks of Houdin or Frikl.

Whatever be the coming fate of Rome, her destiny appears to be, in one respect, the same as from the earliest days of her greatness. She is still doomed to be the prey of hordes of invaders from beyond the Alps. Her present invasion, indeed, is of a species singularly unlike those which were led by the Gaulish and Gothic conquerors of ancient times. It is now her fate to be stormed annually by an army of Britons, and a new Cæsar is required to chronicle the exploits of our irrepressible race in the home of the first conqueror of our island. From Mr. Weld's account, the invading flood seems to be gathering in strength every succeeding year. The Campagna is being rapidly converted

into a species of Continental Leicestershire, and the foxhounds of Protestant England are positively "blessed" by the Pope. The winter at Rome is already an established British institution, and it will soon be a necessary portion of an English lady's education that she should "do" the Vatican and the Forum, and the ceremonies of Christmas and Easter. Already special favours seem to be granted to the heretical invaders, and we shall hardly be surprised if a branch "Mudie" or "Smith" is speedily opened in the immediate neighbourhood of the Piazza di Spagna:—

Why [says Mr. Weld] does not some spirited man open commodious reading-rooms in Rome? They are much wanted, and would assuredly prove remunerative if conducted on liberal principles. If the *entrepreneur* were English, it is probable that greater facilities would be accorded to him for carrying on his business than would be granted to an Italian. Papers that would be stopped at the Post Office if directed to Romans are allowed to enter the English club on the understanding that they will not be permitted to circulate beyond the club.

These favours, indeed, are not of recent date, for we could give the name of one of the most eminent among the art-tradesmen of Rome who, twenty years ago, asked a visitor to send him a copy of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* through some English friend, in whose hands it would be allowed to pass the Custom House, though rigorously forbidden to all Italians.

Unfortunately, it cannot yet be said that our fellow-countrymen have universally learnt to cultivate the decencies of civilized life in a city which, next to Jerusalem, is more calculated than any other spot in the world to teach modesty even to the thoroughbred British snob. It is only a few years ago that sundry Englishwomen actually took their lapdogs into the churches. Who that has travelled cannot parallel the following by some equally disgusting proceedings on the part of those whom Continental ignorance supposes to be English gentlemen?—

With Spring commence, on favourable moonlight nights, those visits to the Colosseum when half the English in Rome seem to throng the mighty arena. The entrance to this ruin is guarded at night by French soldiers.

Accompanying a party one evening, we found a sentinel opposing the passage of an Englishman, who, unprovided with the necessary order of admission, was endeavouring to force his way into the arena. Our countryman, with unwise and ungentlemanly obstinacy, had evidently little respect for the soldier, and was for pushing him aside. But the latter, though physically small, had a great sense of his importance, and after warning the Englishman that he would not allow him to pass without an order, endorsed his words by putting his bayonet to his breast. The sight of the glittering steel quickly subdued the Briton's bluster, for there was no doubt the Frenchman was in earnest. Bearing in mind that orders for admission to the Colosseum are obtainable with the greatest ease, it is, to say the least, highly improper on the part of our countrymen to set regulations at defiance, established for the benefit of visitors to these ruins; for, in the present unsettled state of Rome, it would be extremely dangerous to wander at night through the broken arches of the Colosseum, affording as they do innumerable lurking-places for the assassin, if visitors were not protected by the military. This unruly Englishman was not, however, as bad as another countryman of ours, who, in defiance of sentinels and custodes, rode into the arena of the Colosseum and round it at full gallop, to the imminent danger of those who were within it.

Nor are we English singular in our offensive insolence. The Americans are as bad, and the French, especially the French women, are sometimes worse. The din kept up by their voluble tongues in St. Peter's on great days is all but ceaseless, and we have known it literally such as to prevent those who were near from hearing the very finest portions of the chanting of the Gospels. Nevertheless, it is probable that a certain useful influence may be exercised by these invading British crowds. They serve to strengthen and keep up in the Roman laity that wholesome aversion to sacerdotal government which, sooner or later, must work its destruction. That the Romans have the smallest intention of turning Protestants, whether of the English or German type, may well be doubted. What they desire is, not our religion, but our freedom. In fact, the abolition of the Papacy would be simply ruin to half the inhabitants of Rome. It is only that amazing incapacity to comprehend the signs of the times which blinds nearly the whole body of the Catholic clergy, in Rome and elsewhere, that leads them to confound a hatred of the government of priests with an antipathy to the Roman religion. That hatred is undying. To understand its vitality, we have only to imagine what would be our feelings here at home if the House of Lords and the House of Commons were abolished, and the four-and-twenty Bishops set up as our rulers in their stead.

PRIMITIVE MARRIAGE.*

DID the reader ever ask himself what could have been the origin of that by no means intelligible custom of throwing an old shoe after a departing bride and bridegroom? If he has asked the thrower, he will have learned that the object of the act is to bring "luck" to the young couple; and while meditating on this answer, with its sublime disregard of the possible relations of cause and effect in its implied belief that the ongoings of a complicated society are to be swayed by an old shoe whirling vaguely in the air, he has probably puzzled himself with conjecturing what may have originally suggested the belief. We presume that he remained unsatisfied; in which case he will listen with more interest to a passing suggestion made by Mr. McLennan, that it is probably the lingering symbol of the very ancient and almost universal custom of capturing wives. This custom still lives

* *Primitive Marriage; an Inquiry into the Origin of the Form of Capture in Marriage Ceremonies.* By John F. McLennan, M.A. London and Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1865.

among the Hindus. It prevails among the Khonds in the hill tracts of Orissa, where, the marriage having been settled, a feast is prepared at the house of the bride's father. To the feast succeed dancing and song. According to Major M'Pherson, when the night is far spent, the principals in the scene are raised by an uncle of each upon his shoulders, and borne through the dance. The burdens are suddenly exchanged, and the uncle of the youth disappears with the bride. The assembly divides into two parties; the friends of the bride endeavour to arrest, those of the bridegroom to cover, her flight; and men, women, and children mingle in mock conflict, which is often carried to great lengths. Major-General Campbell gives similar testimony:—

On one occasion [he says] I heard loud cries proceeding from a village close at hand. Fearing some quarrel, I rode to the spot, and there I saw a man bearing away upon his back something enveloped in an ample covering of scarlet cloth; he was surrounded by twenty or thirty young fellows, and by them protected from the desperate attacks made upon him by a party of young women. On seeking an explanation of this novel scene, I was told that the man had just been married, and his precious burden was his blooming bride, whom he was conveying to his own village. Her youthful friends—as it appears is the custom—were seeking to regain possession of her, and hurled stones and bamboos at the head of the devoted bridegroom until he reached his own village. Then the tables were turned, and the bride was fairly won; and off her young friends scampered, screaming and laughing.

Here the attack is only playful, but it symbolizes the attack which once was real—when the bridegroom had to steal his wife, and fight for her, as for any other valuable property; and the symbol is traced by Mr. McLennan under various forms, till it dwindles down to that of the old shoe—which, however, he only lightly indicates, not willing to compromise the seriousness of his argument by adducing an illustration which may be questionable.

The object of this work on *Primitive Marriage* is not simply to exhibit the almost universal prevalence of the form of capture, as proved by its actual existence in barbarous tribes, and its symbolical existence in civilized customs, but also to exhibit the new relations it reveals of the early constitution of society. Obviously these two sources of inquiry—the study of primitive societies, and the study of symbols—furnish the means of classifying social phenomena in their order of development. The inquiries of philologists, valuable as they are, cannot furnish the same solid material; for, as Mr. McLennan suggests, even if we accept the reconstruction of the Aryan social economy as inferred by philologists, we find the Aryans at nearly the same point of advance as that now reached by the pastoral hordes of Kirghiz Tartary. They had marriage laws regulating the rights and obligations of husbands and wives, of parents and children; they recognised the ties of blood through both parents; they had great flocks, and lived under patriarchal rule with monarchical features:—

But these Aryan institutions are—to use the language of geology—post pliocene, separated by a long interval from the foundations of civil society, and throwing back upon them no light. Marriage laws, agnatic relationship, and kingly rule belong, in the order of development, to recent times.

The author has diligently and skilfully collected the evidence which still exists, in order by it to interpret the history of what has been. "The preface to general history must be compiled from the materials presented by barbarism," and he has compiled one interesting section of that preface. Believing that, in law and society, old means old in structure, not in chronology, and that that is most ancient which lies nearest to the beginning of human progress, while that is most modern which is furthest removed from such a beginning, he has interrogated travellers, and compared their statements; and he has traced, under a variety of symbolical forms in the social conditions of advanced nations, the rude modes of life and forms of law of savages. Whenever we discover symbolical forms we are justified in inferring that there were once corresponding realities.

The two universally known symbols of the form of capture in marriage are the Roman and Dorian, which have been generally interpreted as meaning nothing but the popular appreciation of the good fortune of Romulus at the rape of the Sabine women, and, at Sparta, the feeling that a young woman could not surrender her freedom and virgin purity unless compelled by the violence of the stronger sex. Both interpretations are absurd. The story of the rape of the Sabine is obviously a mythical tradition of the ancient method of getting wives and cattle. "Wife-lifting" is inseparable from social conditions where women are valuable and scarce. It lingers still in our expressions of a man's "taking a wife," and making a "conquest." Our ancestors did more than talk of it. As to Müller's hypothesis of an austere delicacy in the Dorian maid, which forced her to preserve a show of resistance, it is not simply without evidence, it is contradictory to all evidence. There is no known example of a primitive people among whom maidenly coyness was the cause of the form of capture of brides.

The symbol of capture appears when, after a contract of marriage is settled, the marriage has to be constituted by the bridegroom or his friends feigning to steal the bride, or carry her away by force. It is this which makes the contract valid. It is signing and sealing. Capture without a previous contract is abduction—a reality, not a symbol. We must refer to Mr. McLennan's pages for the ample and interesting collection of evidence on this subject, drawn from many nations and from all quarters of the globe:—

Each example of the Form leads us to contemplate a great area over which the custom once prevailed, just as a fossil fish in rock on a hill-side forces us to conceive of the whole surrounding country as at one time under water. Were we to enumerate and examine all the customs which seem to us connected with the Form, we should be led into discussions foreign to our purpose, and there would be few primitive races with which we should not

have to deal. Suffice it, that the Form which of old appeared so well defined in the peninsulas of Italy and Greece, may be traced thence, on the one hand, northwards through France and Britain, south-westwards through Spain, and north-eastwards through Prussia; on the other hand, northwards through ancient Thessaly and Macedonia, into the mountainous regions on the Black Sea and the Caspian; again, that the form which is perfect among the Kalmucks shades away into faint and fainter traces throughout almost all the races of the Mongolids; that we may assume it of frequent occurrence in Africa, as it unquestionably was among the red men of America; that it occurs among the Hindus, and may be assumed to have been common among the aboriginal inhabitants of the plains of India, of whom we have a well-preserved specimen in the Khonds of Orissa.

In the presence of this universality of the symbol we naturally ask, what can have been its origin—what was the corresponding reality? The explanation which first suggests itself is, that the symbol merely indicates primitive wife-lifting. But this, on examination, turns out defective. How came the association in the popular mind between marriage and rapine so firmly fixed that the validity of marriage required at least the pretence of rapine? The fact of wife-lifting will not explain this except on the supposition that all marriages were originally preceded by rapine. To create such an association of ideas it must have been the system of certain tribes to capture women of other tribes; and this system, our author justly concludes, could not have sprung out of the mere desire of savages to possess objects cherished by a foreign tribe, but must be sought in their circumstances, their ideal of kinship, and their tribal arrangements. Where the feeling in the tribe was such that marriages were forbidden out of the tribe, it is clear that there was no room for fraud or force. The tribe was one family; the bride and bridegroom merely members of the family. This is what Mr. McLennan calls the case of an "endogamous tribe"—a new word, and a somewhat infelicitous one, but representing a very specific idea, and correlated with "exogamous tribe," which expresses the idea of marriage forbidden within the tribe, and admitting only of wives being taken from other tribes. In the former case, wives could obviously neither be stolen nor bought; in the latter case, they could only be obtained by these means. When neighbouring tribes are in a state of amity, one tribe loses a woman by marriage, another gains one. Such a marriage must be a matter of barter. The woman is property, and is paid for. But—and this is necessarily the case among very savage peoples—when tribes are not living in amity, wives must be stolen. The prevalence of female infanticide made women scarce; and, as wives were wanted, it was thought better economy to steal them than to rear them:—

If it can be shown, firstly, that exogamous tribes exist, or have existed; and secondly, that in rude times the relations of separate tribes are uniformly, or almost uniformly, hostile, we have found a set of circumstances in which men could get wives only by capturing them—a social condition in which capture would be the necessary preliminary to marriage. And if it be shown in a reasonable number of well-authenticated cases that these conditions—exogamy as tribal law, and hostility as the prevailing relation of separate tribes towards each other—exist or have existed, accompanied, as might have been expected, by a system of capturing wives, we shall be justified in concluding—failing the appearance of any phenomena inconsistent with such an explanation—that the same conditions have existed in every case where the system of capture prevailed, or where the form of capture has been observed as a ceremony of marriage. Nothing more than this is necessary to satisfy the conditions of a sound hypothesis.

And this Mr. McLennan has shown on ample evidence. He shows, moreover, that, in all the modern cases where the symbol of capture is most strongly marked, marriage within the tribe is considered incestuous. Indeed, it is apparent, on the mere statement of the case, that, when friendly relations came to be established among exogamous tribes, and their members intermarried by purchase (*coemptio*) instead of by capture, the form of capture would become an essential ceremony out of respect for old traditions. The established idea of marriage being one of capture, to make a marriage valid the form of capture was necessary. Thus Roman youths rush in with drawn swords, and pretend to act a scene of violence; the Kalmuck bride rides as if for life from the husband who has already bought her.

Our author is led to many interesting speculations on the early forms of society, in which he endeavours to show that the most ancient system in which the idea of blood-relationship was embodied admitted kinship through females only. The primitive groups were homogeneous. The system of kinship through females, and not through males, tended to render the exogamous groups heterogeneous, and thus superseded the practice of capturing wives. In the advance from savagery to civility the system of kinship through females only was succeeded by a system of kinship through males also; and this, in most cases, passed into a system which acknowledged kinship through males only. This system tended to rear up homogeneous groups, and thus to restore the original state—where the exogamous prejudice survived—as regards both the practice of capturing wives, and the evolution of the symbol of capture. Thus, a local tribe, under the combined influence of exogamy and female kinship, might attain a balance of persons of different sexes, regarded as being of different descent, and its members might intermarry. A tribe having reached this stage, and grown proud, might decline intermarriage with other tribes, and thus become a *caste*. On kinship becoming agnatic, the members of such a tribe might yield to the universal tendency of rude races to eponymy, and feign themselves to be derived from a common ancestor, and so become homogeneous. In this way, some exogamous tribes become endogamous.

It is impossible here to give any view of the evidence on which the author founds these speculations. Nothing more conclusive or more interesting has been written than his chapter

on the growth of the idea of kinship, and its influence on the structure of primitive societies. There is a certain shock to our prejudices in learning that the earliest tribes really had no idea whatever of kinship, such as exists in later conditions of society; but it is clearly made out that men had originally no more idea of blood-relationship than animals have. Individuals were at first affiliated, not to persons, but to a group. The new idea of blood-relationship, when it emerged, would be rather that of a system of blood-ties among the individuals of a group; these would become brethren. But how did it come to pass that the first idea of kinship was through females only, and not through males? Simply from the fact that maternity was certain, and paternity excessively dubious—polyandry rendering paternity indistinguishable. When there came to be certainty as to the father's blood, without certainty as to the father, which must have been the case where all the possible fathers were brothers, the idea of kinship through males also arose. Mr. McLennan says, "It may be doubted whether the blood-tie through the father is entitled to rank with that through the mother." But here he is misled by an imperfect acquaintance with physiology. "It may be," he says, "that the connexion between father and child is less intimate than that between mother and child, as regards the transmission of characteristics, mental or physical." We beg to assure him that it is nothing of the kind; and, without here setting forth the physiological grounds of our denial, it may suffice if we call his attention to the single fact that, were the influence of the mother preponderant, there would be a gradual obliteration of all the masculine characteristics, children would in each successive generation become more and more feminine in mind and body—which is certainly not the case. However, into this, as into many other questions raised by this suggestive little book, we cannot here enter. Mr. McLennan has opened a new path in historical research. Those who follow may have to modify his conclusions on some points, but all philosophic students will gratefully acknowledge his services as a pioneer.

OLD ENGLISH PLAYS IN GERMANY.*

THE collection of early German plays published by Ludwig Tieck in 1817, and the remarks of the editor, first, we believe, directed attention to the probable fact that, while the Elizabethan drama was flourishing in the country of its birth, a number of English actors performed in Germany, having brought with them their own repertory. Certain old German plays that looked like certain old English plays had been preserved; and as in these similarity did not even approximate to identity, they led to the conjecture that in them was to be found the crudest dramatic form of those English dramatists whose subjects were afterwards treated in a more finished manner by Shakespeare and others. Thus, as we arrive at some knowledge of the New Greek Comedy through the medium of Terence and Plautus, it was supposed we might obtain an increased knowledge of our own early theatre through the medium of foreign adaptations.

A magnificent volume, encompassing a vast mass of information, discussion, and material in connexion with this curious subject, has been compiled by Herr Albert Cohn, a personal friend of Tieck's, and withal an erudite and cautious critic. The first and smaller part of the work contains a very full account by Herr Cohn himself of the dramatic relations between the English and Germans at the period under consideration; the second part contains the texts of six of those old German plays that especially bear upon the question of dramatic relationship. These are the *Beautiful Sidea*, the *Beautiful Phenicia*, *Julius and Hippolyta*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Fratricide punished*, or *Hamlet Prince of Denmark*, and *Romeo and Juliet*. The texts have been carefully collated and are accompanied by English versions written by competent scholars. Two of them, the *Beautiful Sidea* and the *Beautiful Phenicia* (the only one of the six which is not given entire), are in rhyme, and this has increased the labour of their translator, Professor Solly, who has closely followed the version of the original.

That an immense stride in German dramatic art was made towards the end of the sixteenth century, there is no doubt. After those ecclesiastical plays with which the history of the modern drama commences in every Christian country, the earliest pieces in Germany seem to have been the "Fastnachtspiele" (Shrove-tide plays), first performed in Nuremberg about the middle of the fifteenth century. The subjects of these pieces were derived from actual and even local life, and they were performed in the houses of private citizens. Hans Rosenblut and Hans Foltz are said to have been the first writers of "Fastnachtspiele," which, as may be surmised, were originally remarkable for coarseness and indecency, but which in the sixteenth century were elevated in every way by the immortal shoemaker Hans Sachs, who used antique and mediæval fables, Italian novels, and history sacred and profane, as materials for his works.

Nuremberg, indeed, was the Athens of Germany, as far as the drama was concerned, and as early as 1550, boasted of a permanent theatre. Augsburg soon followed the example of Nuremberg, while in other cities the only theatrical performances took place in private houses, or at inns, on a platform composed of casks, and called a "podium." The permanent theatres had a broad stage, and a deep proscenium, and they were

surrounded by an unroofed amphitheatre, intended for spectators. We may hence infer that they in some degree resembled the so-called "public theatres" of London, in the Elizabethan time, though, without due authority, we must not push the resemblance too far. It is true that in the "public theatres" the yard or pit was uncovered, and they were thus distinguished from the "private theatres," which were roofed all over; but there is no reason to believe that the occupants of the boxes were exposed to the open air. Possibly the distinction made in London between different classes of patrons was unknown to old Nuremberg.

Mr. Collins's *Annals of the Stage* may be quoted, strange to say, for the purpose of showing that there was no permanent theatre in England before 1576, when Blackfriars was built, and also for the purpose of proving that the so-called "Theatre" in Shoreditch, and its neighbour the "Curtain," existed some years before. However, there is no hypothesis that will give us a permanent playhouse in London before 1570; and, as we find one twenty years sooner at Nuremberg, we might be tempted to infer that the German drama reached a comparatively mature state earlier than the English. But the contrary is the fact. When England had professional actors without a theatre, Germany had a theatre without professional actors. In the latter country, at a time when companies of strolling players, who had no other vocation, were permeating England, the plays were entirely performed by citizens, and that they were designed to amuse the performers rather than the spectators will be easily believed by those who are familiar with amateur theatricals.

England enjoyed an early celebrity for her proficiency in dramatic art, and in the golden age of Elizabeth was frequently visited by German princes and nobility, to whom it was, as it were, a new world. The announcement by Bardolph, in the *Merry Wives of Windsor* (act iv. s. 3), of the arrival of the German Duke is supposed by Herr Cohn not only to refer to the visit of Count Frederic of Mömpelgard (afterwards Duke of Wirtemberg) to England in 1592, but to imply that he was brought into some connexion with the English stage. Still more to the point is the statement of Ludwig, Prince of Anhalt, who visited London in 1596, and wrote a rhymed description of his travels:—

There are four theatres to see here,
Where princes, too, and kings and emperors appear
In the true size of life, in handsome robes arrayed,
And mention of their deeds as they befit is made.

We may observe that the above, which we extract from Herr Cohn, is translated with admirable accuracy from the original. The following note, which Herr Cohn appends to the statement, lacks clearness:—

The prince notices four play-houses only, but it is a known fact that there were at least seven, and perhaps ten, theatres in London in 1596—namely, the theatre in Shoreditch, the Blackfriars, the Curtain, Paris Gardens, the Globe, the Rose, and Newington Butts, and perhaps the Whitefriars, the Rose (sic), and the Swan. The author's speaking of four only is explained by the fact that not all the theatres were open at that time in summer, or perhaps the prince had visited those theatres which were called "public," and not those which were called "private."

We may assume that one of the two "Roses" is a misprint for the "Hope," but the supposition that a prince would naturally prefer the "public" to the "private" theatres is past our comprehension, inasmuch as the latter were the more aristocratic of the two. The fact that the traveller was in London in the months of June and July may indeed lead us to admit that he possibly knew nothing of the Blackfriars, which was only open in the winter. Still, if he went to the Globe, where the Blackfriars' Company played in the summer, it would not have been because he preferred a public theatre like the Globe to a private theatre like the Blackfriars, but because he had no other opportunity of seeing the best players in London.

That in the sixteenth century the German stage received vitality from the English seems to be an admitted fact. The question has been as to the medium of communication. Did English actors go to Germany, or did Germans, visiting England, take English plays home with them? On documentary evidence, Herr Cohn decides in favour of the former hypothesis, which, indeed, he establishes beyond the reach of doubt. The English influence first began to exert itself in high places, Duke Henry Julius of Brunswick, who was born in 1563 and died in 1613, having been the first dramatist of what may be called the new school. He began with a *Tragi-comedy of Susanna*, in which there is a jester, John Clant, closely copied from the English clown. A subsequent work, entitled the *Tragedy of the Profligate Son*, seems to reflect that savage kind of English drama of which *Titus Andronicus*, the *Spanish Tragedy*, and the *Jew of Malta* are choice specimens. The "sensational incidents" are thus summed up in an amusingly business-like style by Herr Cohn:—

A boy's body is cut open on the stage, the murderer drinks his blood, roasts his heart over a coal fire and eats it. Then he drives a nail into his father's head, strangles his cousin, cuts his mother's throat, and then, at a meal, suddenly finds the heads of the murdered upon the dishes instead of viands. . . . Afterwards the murdered persons appear as ghosts, drive the murderer mad, and carry him off.

We hope and trust that the honest Brunswickers who were recreated with this extremely "spicy" spectacle duly appreciated the advance that their drama had made in consequence of the infusion of a foreign element. In a third piece by the Duke, called the *Comedy of Vincentius Ladislaus*, there is a slight resemblance to the portion of *Much Ado about Nothing* in which Beatrice and Benedict are the principal personages, and there appears to be no doubt that the German play is the older of the

* *Shakespeare in Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* By Albert Cohn. London: Asher & Co.

two. Much stronger is the similarity between the *Adulteress*, which is also by Duke Henry Julius, and the *Merry Wives of Windsor*; for here Galliochora, a jealous husband, and Pamphilus, a poor student, stand in exactly the same relation to each other as Ford and Falstaff, and there is an escape in a cart full of clothes corresponding to the incident of the buck-basket. There is, however, no Datchet Mead, for the wife, who bears the frightfully significant name of Scortum, favours Pamphilus; and the tale ends tragically—Galliochora going mad, and Scortum being strangled by devils. This last incident is curious. When the devil, in a legendary story, carries off an unfortunate sinner, it is generally by virtue of some compact, as in the case of Faust; whereas his appearance on earth in his retributive character, merely on account of moral depravity, as in the case of Don Juan and in the play just noticed, is rare indeed. These and the like instances, proving the introduction of a new form of drama into Germany in the time of our Elizabeth, are enough to show that the German stage had undergone an English influence. But to show the exact manner in which that influence was exercised requires criticism in the case of each play. What antiquarians would like to prove is, that the early German pieces which are older than the corresponding plays of Shakspeare are translated from old English dramas which are now lost, but from which Shakspeare derived plots, as he did from the "six old plays" familiar to every bibliographer. Now, when the plot of the earlier German and the later English play is to be found in an Italian novel, it is always difficult to show that both the works were not immediately derived from the same common source, unless a very strong case can be made out of a quasi-identity of dialogue.

A very important person in the history of the German stage in the sixteenth century is Jacob Ayrrer, a dramatist of Nuremberg, who died early in the century following. Two plays by this author, *Die Comedia in der Schönen Sidea* and *Die Comedia in der Schönen Phœnicia*, were published in the collection of Ludwig Tieck, who called attention to a connexion between these pieces and the *Tempest* and *Much Ado about Nothing* of Shakspeare. That the points of resemblance are strong there is no doubt. Thus, in both the *Sidea* and the *Tempest*, we find two hostile princes, one of whom has a spirit in his service, and uses magic to get the son of the other into his power, and a reconciliation is effected at the end of both by the marriage of the magician's daughter with the captive son of his enemy. Runcifall, the devil in the *Sidea*, somewhat combines the qualities of Ariel and Caliban; Prince Engelhedt, who corresponds to Ferdinand, is magically disarmed by the sticking of his sword in its scabbard; and altogether, on the more than probable assumption that Ayrrer's play was written long before Shakspeare's, there are strong temptations to adopt Tieck's hypothesis that it was based on some lost old English piece, which also furnished matter to the *Tempest*. On the other hand, the comic scenes of the pieces are utterly dissimilar; and Herr Cohn—who is a cautious critic, and has observed that, where Ayrrer's sources are known, he has almost always retained the original names of his principal personages—remarks that it is highly improbable that the purely German names which belong to the personages in the *Sidea* could have occurred in an early English comedy of the sixteenth century. Fatherland was not exactly an Avernus from which there was no return, and it is possible that one of our old friends the travelling English comedians, who took so much with them to Germany, brought back a copy of the *Sidea* in his pocket, greatly to the advantage of Shakspeare. This supposition is not regarded with disfavour by Herr Cohn, but the theory which it involves is disagreeable. If we can establish that, wherever there is a similarity between a German and an English play, the former has necessarily an English source, we are on the road towards new discoveries with respect to the history of our early drama. If, on the other hand, the Englishman is just as likely to borrow from the German as the German from the Englishman, we do not exactly know what we learn in discovering dramatic affinities. Even the agreeable doctrine that our dramatic forefathers were so very beneficial to the German stage becomes vague and hazy.

However, as we proceed, we come to a collection of plays in the German language which are professedly "English comedies and tragedies," and were supposed to constitute the repertory of the travelling English companies. This was printed in 1620, and contains, *inter alia*, a *Titus Andronicus*, and a play entitled *Julius and Hippolyta*, which is obviously related to the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. But it is generally to be observed, in the case of these pieces, that they are wholly devoid of poetical merit, and look as if they were the subjects of English plays, dramatically stated, rather than the plays themselves. Why should the English comedians, journeying in quest of foreign cash and laurels, put their plays on the stage in such a dreadfully mutilated state? This question is asked by Herr Cohn, and its consideration leads him to the opinion that the collection is the work of uneducated speculators, whose object it was to spoil the market for the English, and appropriate the subjects for the benefit of the Germans; and that the pieces, far from furnishing an authentic text, were taken down in a hurry from the mouths of actors.

From the whole investigation, we derive two or three broad facts which may be looked upon as fairly established. There seems to be no doubt that in the sixteenth century English actors performed in different parts of Germany under distinguished patronage; that their dramas were superior, as works of art, to anything that had been previously seen by the Germans; and that

the Elizabethan mode of treating subjects was adopted as a model by native playwrights. To establish details, the history and peculiarities of each play that falls under consideration must be critically studied; and it is the great value of Herr Cohn's book that it not only conveys his own views, but furnishes the critic with a mass of material on which he may frame theories of his own.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD AMONGST THE PHILISTINES.*

TWO or three months ago we made some observations on an article of Mr. Matthew Arnold's, in the *National Review*, on the functions of criticism. Mr. Arnold has republished that and some other essays in an excellent little volume, which contains, amongst other things, a preface replying in the most goodhumoured manner imaginable to his various critics, and several notes levelled at our article. We have, on former occasions, remarked upon most of the essays thus republished, and we do not mean to return to them. They have very good points. Some of them are exceedingly interesting, and all of them display a remarkable power of appreciation. Thus the essays on Heine, on Marcus Aurelius, on the Pagan and Mediæval Moral Sentiment, and two others on Maurice and Eugénie de Guérin, are all full of interest, and will introduce the great bulk of Mr. Arnold's readers to topics with which they are not likely to have been familiar previously, and to a mode of treatment which he is certainly right in considering as uncommon in English periodical writing. We heartily wish them success. They form a most agreeable volume, written in excellent taste by a refined and highly cultivated man. There are, however, other matters in the book on which we should wish to say a word or two in a tone, if possible, as goodhumoured as that of Mr. Arnold himself. His retorts upon our criticisms are in perfect good temper, and some of them are very happy. His Preface is a curiosity, coming as it does from a man who has suffered many things from many reviewers, and is determined to be no better, but rather to become worse, and to go on not only repeating, but even exaggerating, the sins for which it was their painful duty to take him to task. Like the early Christians exposed to wild beasts in the arena, Mr. Arnold has been baited by reviewers. For instance, he is attacked by Mr. Wright, the translator of Homer, and by one "Presbyter Anglicanus," whom he accuses of writing, not merely in the *Examiner*, but in "half a dozen of the daily newspapers" as well. The *Guardian* has acted toward him the part of a "kind monitor," and has charged him with making jokes. He stands in awe of the "magnificent roaring of the young lions of the *Daily Telegraph*," though whether they have actually assailed him or not does not appear; and the *Saturday Review* has treated him most unkindly. His attitude in the midst of this storm of censure is almost as peaceful as that of Daniel in the den of lions, seated, as the showman observed, on his three-legged stool and reading the *Times* newspaper. He returns blessings for curses, gently reproves the *Examiner*, gravely exonerates the *Guardian* from the faintest suspicion of levity, suggests for the Editor of the *Saturday Review* the honour of a statue in a temple dedicated to Philistinism, and asks Mr. Wright—who, it appears, lives at Mapperley—for information about Wragg, the young woman whose arrest Mr. Arnold so feelingly deplored in his remarkable contribution to the *National Review*. We will not object to the statue which he proposes for us, and let him have all the honours of the small war which we have carried on; nay, we will even tell him something about Wragg. She is still in custody in Nottingham Gaol, and will be tried at the assizes to be held there sometime between the 9th and 13th of next month. The only objection to Mr. Arnold's Preface is that it is too goodnatured. There is no pleasure in hitting a man who will not hit you back again; who says meekly that it is not his nature to "dispute on behalf of any opinion . . . very obstinately"; who cares little for argument, and "has a profound respect for intuitions"; who thinks that truth is something to be seen, and not to be proved; and who, strong in that conviction, sees exclusively by his own inner light, and, like the humming-bird when pressed in the chase (to quote the showman a second time), retires into his interior by creeping down his own throat, whence, illuminated by the inner light, he smiles benignantly on his baffled pursuers.

Admitting that it is not easy to argue with any one who takes such an ethereal view of things, and has such a pleasant way of slipping through every difficulty, we must notice one or two of his replies, inasmuch as they illustrate the texture of his mind and the principles which pervade every word that he writes. In our former notice we observed upon Mr. Arnold's passion for eternal truths, and remarked that, after all, he specified only one eternal truth, which appeared to us to be false. The great principle in question, reiterated in the present volume, was and is as follows:—

To count by tens is the simplest way of counting; that is a proposition of which every one from here to the antipodes feels the force—so at least I should say if we did not live in a country where it is not impossible that any morning we may find a letter in the *Times* declaring a decimal coinage an absurdity.

On this we observed that the proposition in question is not true; that counting by tens is not the simplest way of counting, though there is a certain degree of convenience in taking the base

* *Essays in Criticism*. By Matthew Arnold. London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co.

of an established system of notation, whether it happens to be ten or anything else, as the unit of tables of coinage or weights and measures. We further observed that the number ten is a very inconvenient base, especially for low numbers, and that twelve is far more convenient. Hence we argued that, to make his proposition true, it ought to have been stated thus:—It is convenient to take an established base of notation as the unit of tables of coinage, weights, and measures. If ten is given as the established base of notation, then to count by tens is the simplest way of counting for numbers above twenty. If Mr. Arnold looks back to the article in question, he will see that this was the result of our criticism. He has followed our statement hastily, and has ascribed to us the following strange piece of nonsense:—

To take as your unit an established base of notation, ten being given as the base of notation, is, except for numbers under twenty, the simplest way of counting.

We said nothing of the sort. Indeed the words have no meaning. He then goes on to make the following remark:—

The mass of Frenchmen, by legislating as they did, showed a keen susceptibility to purely rational intellectual considerations. On the other hand, does my reviewer say that we keep our monetary system unchanged because our nation has grasped the intellectual proposition, which he puts in his masterly way thus: "to count by twelves has the advantage of taking for your unit a number in itself far more convenient than ten for that purpose"? Surely not; but because our system is there, and we are too practical a people to trouble ourselves about its intellectual aspect.

Mr. Arnold has again done our statement injustice. The two lines which he quotes as an "intellectual proposition" form one step in an argument which fills a paragraph of twenty-two lines, and which we think Mr. Arnold will not find it easy to condense into a smaller compass. It would be absurd to say that our monetary system is upheld because it is duodecimal. It is neither purely duodecimal nor purely decimal, but a mixture of the two; and, whatever Mr. Arnold may think, we said before, and now repeat, that the reason why the English people keep the system unchanged is that the Decimal Coinage Commissioners proved, on purely theoretical grounds, that it is a more convenient one than the decimal system. The "mass of Frenchmen" no doubt trusted the opinion of some Commission of their own, and the difference between the two countries is a difference of theory. This is the very point which we tried to establish, and which Mr. Arnold is apparently quite unable to understand. Does he deny that there ever was a Decimal Coinage Commission, or that it reported in favour of the existing system, or that it gave reasons for so reporting, or that it was on account of that report that the system was maintained? Unless he can deny one at least of these propositions, he must admit that the question is between theory and theory, not between theory and neglect of theory. To say that "we are too practical a people to trouble ourselves about the intellectual aspect" of the question is really to talk without a meaning. In proportion as people are practical they act in a reasonable manner. What could be less practical than to refuse to substitute a rational and convenient for an irrational and inconvenient system of coinage? and how can a system of coinage be rational unless and except in so far as it is convenient?

Another of Mr. Arnold's observations is even more curious. He said, and says again, "When one looks at the English Divorce Court . . . which in the ideal sphere is so hideous . . . one may be permitted to find the marriage theory of Catholicism elevating and refreshing." Upon this we observed that Mr. Arnold had no right to object to practical measures on theoretical grounds, and that he ought to wait to abuse the Divorce Court till he had got a theory which would fully explain all the duties of the Legislature in the matter of marriage. Upon this Mr. Arnold remarks:—"My critic wants me to produce a plan for a new and improved Divorce Court before I call the present one hideous. But God forbid that I should thus enter into competition with the Lord Chancellor!" God forbid, indeed, for Mr. Arnold's own sake; but his critic wanted no such thing. We carefully avoided saying what Mr. Arnold puts into our mouths. Our demand was, not for a working plan, but for "a theory which will fully explain all the duties of the Legislature on the subject of marriage." A Court which has to deal with adultery cannot of course be ornamental. The question therefore is, whether the Divorce Court is more hideous than it ought to be. This depends on the question, what is the theory on which a legislator ought to deal with marriage? and unless Mr. Arnold can state such a theory and defend it, he has no right to condemn the existing Court. Not only is he unable to state such a theory, but he does not seem to see the necessity for it. He says, indeed, that he condemns the Divorce Court because "it is not the result of any legislator's meditations on the subject of marriage. Rich people had an anomalous privilege of getting divorced; privileges are odious, and we said everybody should have the same chance. There was no meditation about marriage here; that was just the mischief." It is amusing to hear Mr. Arnold say that impatience of an "anomaly" was the reason why the Divorce Court was established. It is one of the counts in his indictment against the gross British Philistine that he does not care for anomalies. A few pages before, he had said, "For a thing to be an anomaly we consider to be no objection to it whatever." Where, however, did he learn that "no meditation about marriage" preceded the legislation which produced the Divorce Court? The subject had been discussed in England for a great length of time, and from every point of view, and it is quite easy to state the theory upon which

the final legislation proceeded. The people of this country had gradually come to the conclusion that there ought to be a way of judicially dissolving marriage in certain cases. The "idea" of the Court, to use Mr. Arnold's own phraseology, is not hard to describe. It is that *in foro humano* marriage ought to be considered as a condition founded on a contract in which the public are interested, and which therefore ought not to be dissolved without the intervention of the law, and for causes legally defined; and that the rights and duties of the married state *in foro divino*, be they what they may, ought to be enforced by the conscientious, and not by the legal, sanction. He will find, if he turns to the Statute-Book, that this theory, not of marriage itself, but of the relation of the English Legislature to marriage (which is a very different thing), influenced many other Acts of Parliament besides the one in question—for instance, the Marriage Act of 1836, which it would be absurd to ascribe to impatience of an anomaly. This theory may be true or false, but it is just as much a theory as any other; and Mr. Arnold, in this as in all other cases, shows himself perfectly unable to conceive that any one can hold any theory at all which is not expressed in some short, smart phrase, like "the Catholic idea of marriage which exhibits marriage as indissoluble," "that Protestant idea of marriage which exhibits it as a union terminable by mutual consent."

Unable or unwilling to comply with what we think was a very reasonable demand—the demand for a theory of the relations between the Legislature and marriage as a condition precedent to the condemnation of a practical measure—Mr. Arnold does give us some sort of advice, if he gives us no guidance:—

If my practical critic will himself accompany me for a little while into the despoiled world of ideas; if, renouncing any attempt to patch hastily up, with a noble disdain for transcendentalism, our present Divorce law, he will but allow his mind to dwell a little first on the Catholic idea of marriage which exhibits marriage as indissoluble, and then upon that Protestant idea of marriage which exhibits it as a union terminable by mutual consent; if he will meditate well on these, and afterwards on the thought of what married life according to its idea really is, of what family life really is, of what social life really is, and national life and public morals, he will find after a while, I do assure him, the whole state of his spirit quite changed; the Divorce Court will then seem to him, if he looks at it, strangely hideous; and he will at the same time discover in himself, as the fruit of his inward discipline, lights and resources for making it better of which he does not dream.

Mr. Arnold, of course, has gone through all this "inward discipline" himself; for, if he has not, how can he possibly know what effect it will produce? Why then does he not comply with our request, and give us, as the fruit of his reflections and of the lights and resources which they have produced in him, a theory of the relations of the Legislature to marriage? No one asks him for practical details, but we have a right to ask for a statement of general principles. If he has them, why not state them? If he has them not, his contemplations have produced no effect. As matters stand, we cannot but suspect the real truth to be that Mr. Arnold, like every other decent person, has been much disgusted by the reports of the Divorce Court trials; that he knows little or nothing about jurisprudence, or about the way in which law-makers ought to deal with marriage or with the other great interests of life; and that he feels pleasure in using vague and big phrases about "the Catholic idea" and "the Protestant idea," "married life according to its idea," &c. &c., without attaching any particular meaning to those words.

It is no reproach to any one to be a man of taste and not a man of thought, but he ought not to deny to the whole English nation the power of thinking, merely because their thoughts do not happen to be expressed in a way which suits his taste. He ought also to try to understand that people may be influenced by difficult as well as by easy theories, and that in this complicated world the difficult theories are very often the true ones.

TONY BUTLER.*

THAT there is a fashion in novels, and that it seriously affects their success, is well known to all readers. But it is not so easy to decide how long a new style of novel lasts. Styles do not change as rapidly as bonnets; nor, on the other hand, has any literary fashion in works of fiction remained quite so long "in" as crinoline. Interesting governesses came into vogue with *Jane Eyre*, but they did not hold their ground long; there was a sudden ending to autobiographies of plain self-possessed young women who subdued rebellious pupils, and made love by listening to revelations of fast life. A few years ago we were threatened with a deluge of books written by ladies, and treating, with an audacity that was half-ignorance and half the wish to appear knowing, subjects from which English male writers had long held back; but even that piquante novelty has passed on the public taste. Mr. Trollope brought country clergymen to the foreground, and unveiled the secrets concealed beneath the clerical vest; but his domain was soon invaded by the literary young ladies who burned to tell the tale of the High Church curates and to be the chroniclers of other small beer. Mr. Dickens set the fashion of vigorous photography of common life, of mysterious plots on which even the last chapter threw no light, and of unaccountable escapades by virtuous heroines that not even ten pages of explanation, in very short sentences, at all helped to make clear. Then followed Mr. Wilkie Collins, with novels all plot, and

* Tony Butler. 3 vols. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons.

constructed so like a riddle in three volumes that if you knew the solution you lost the interest of the tale. Distinct from all these is what may be called the "genteel Irish" novel, introduced by Mr. Lever, *facile princeps* in this school. Maxwell and Lover had already given us the Irishman of low life, with sketches intermixed of Irish landlords and squireens in "the good old times," but their books were to Mr. Lever's what broad farce is to light comedy. His stories are mainly of travelled Irishmen of the middle class. It is easy enough to anticipate his tales. His young hero spends his youth in his own country—that is essential; and, generally speaking, is remarkable for athletic power, intellectual deficiency, and a tendency to fall in boyish love with some young lady rather older than himself, and who would be far above him in station only for the good old rule that "one Irish family is always as good as another—if not better." Of course the young gentleman is torn away; he enters the English, French, Austrian, or Garibaldian army; he becomes aide-de-camp to an emperor, a field-marshal, or a filibuster; he serves with distinction, gets several wounds, and has brain-fever. This is essential. We do not remember any of Mr. Lever's novels where the hero did not get brain-fever; it is as inevitable as James's "last rays of the setting sun," or Wouvermans' "white horse;" or perhaps it is a kind of "trade mark" to preclude piracy. A Sister of Charity is then introduced, and scraps of French light up the story. Then we have more adventure; some temporary infidelity to the first love, in the shape of a flirtation with an Austrian princess, or a Spanish signora, or an Italian *dama*; the presence of the hero at a great battle—Leipsic, Waterloo, Solferino, or the capture of Naples; intimate conversations with Napoleon, Blucher, Wellington, Cavour, Talleyrand, or Garibaldi; and restoration, finally, to the object of his early attachment, who has followed him &c., thrilled at &c. &c., and "wept tears of joy to hear him praised." This is the only Lever novel; without these marks none are genuine. One would think that, "without the author's signature," we could not rely upon the real article. But the new story, *Tony Butler*, dispels this delusion. Whether Mr. Lever merely wishes to conceal his name, or whether he has lent his pen to some brother of the craft, there can be no doubt that we have here all the old conditions of those light gentlemanly tales. There is, as usual, no plot to speak of; the slight personal interest we take in the hero is the only thread to connect the history of various adventures at home and abroad. The characters are, where slightly sketched, very happily hit off; but where the author wishes to depict some strikingly peculiar personage the portrait is, as usual, a caricature.

One of the best-drawn characters in the book is the hero, Tony Butler; but *vraisemblance* alone cannot make interesting one who is nothing but a most ordinary young gentleman of great physical powers. As a subsidiary personage, he might have done very well, but, after our first sympathy for a fine manly young fellow who has no chance of passing the Civil Service examination, we get rather tired of a hero who cannot even write an ordinary business letter, and whose thoughts are never clear. His boy-life is hinted at rather than described, and there is a great charm in the picture of his happiness as the factotum of Lyle Abbey, the dictator of everything in it and about it, from the fruit garden to the stables, the prime minister of its whole out-of-door life, the brother to the two frank pleasant Irish girls, and the hopeless worshipper of one. The relations between him and his mother—well described by a few good touches—are also full of true home life. But the interest to a great extent ceases when he leaves Ireland; and without a centre of unity the story flags. This indeed is one of the defects of these novels of adventure—stories where the characters do not force your attention nor the plot pique your curiosity. They are very pleasant while you are reading them, but you can lay them down; and should you by accident be deprived of the pleasure of resuming them, you are not inconsolable in your grief. You never forget, while perusing them, that they are stories; that the characters are trotted out one by one, very differently ticketed and coloured just because variety was required. For instance, in this new story we have an Irish major, who, taken by himself, is an amusing character—a Bobadil with courage, a brave Parolles, a Major Gahagan that, if he boasts very loudly, can also fight. Although there have been many antetypes of the character, although swaggering Irish soldiers have been depicted before, yet the Miles M'Caskey of the tale before us is sketched with such vigour that we could heartily welcome him as a relief to the comparative tameness of the other characters, were it not that, introduced into a story professedly of the present day, he is simply an anachronism. There was a time when a rattling, rollicking, impudent Irish major like M'Caskey—vulgar in loud talk, but with a dash of humour to make it tolerable—could shoulder his way through life, trusting to his sword or pistol to get him out of the scrapes into which he had been brought by an unruly tongue. But that was in those excessively good old duelling times when attorneys at a contested election brought pistols with them, as they now would hand-books of electoral law, and when men did not dare to refuse the challenge of any man who happened to be in the social position of a gentleman. To paint such a man as carrying all before him in the present day—for the story is dated the year Garibaldi conquered Naples—is certainly a mistake. Doubtless there are, in Ireland and elsewhere, men quite willing and able to play the old part over again, and to win success in society by an appeal to their physical courage; but society does not at all encourage them to any such displays, and Major Miles M'Caskey, instead of overawing gentle-

men, or "shooting them at sight," would now-a-days find himself exiled from all decent company, and, if troublesome, handed over to the police. Yet the author of *Tony Butler*, utterly ignoring this, paints an Irish swaggerer of the era of Sir Jonah Barrington, and represents him as a successful hero of the present time—his boasts half-believed, his society tolerated, his wild pranks condoned. It may be convenient for an author to take a striking character of one age and to bring him into connexion with a striking event of our own time, such as Garibaldi's march on Naples, and no doubt it gives variety to the story, but only such variety as if he introduced a Mohawk with lace ruffles and a drawn sword engaged in a combat with Policeman X. The author is guilty of the same kind of fault when he describes his young hero as going to Downing Street to ask for a place, threatening to kick the hall porter, called up before the Under Secretary for that offence, but nominated on the spot by Lord Ledgerton ("an elderly man, white-whiskered and white-haired, but his figure well set-up, and his hat rakishly placed a very little on one side"), who accidentally passes through the room and remembers that some one had recommended him. That incident would do very well for the start in life of an Irish Gil Blas of, say, fifty or even twenty years ago, but it does not chime in with our new habits, or with present-day life. Again, a bit of the past is dragged in head and shoulders, not for its truth, but because it is telling:—

"I don't want to know him better," burst in Tony. "I got into a scrape already with just such another: he was collector for the port of Derry, and I threw him out of the window, and all the blame was laid upon me."

"Well, that certainly was hard," said Vance, with a droll twinkle of his eye. "I call that very hard."

"So do I, after the language he used to me, saying all the while, 'I'm no duellist—I'm not for a sawpit, with coffee and pistols for two,' and all that vulgar slang about murder and such like."

"And was he much hurt?"

"No, not much. It was only his collar-bone and one rib, I think. I forget now, for I had to go over to Skye, and stay there a good part of the summer."

In another instance, the author, anxious to make a light-comedy character, introduces a Foreign Office clerk, whose boasts of his universal knowledge and power are a poor copy of Goldsmith's inimitable Lofty, but are still poorer when represented as imposing even on a lovesick girl like Bella Lyle. That a feather-headed young fellow in the Foreign Office may think himself the main-spring of politics is quite possible, but not even a gaping rustic crowd would believe his boasts; and it is absurd to represent him as listened to and looked up to by people like the Lyles. These faults, however, belong to the nature of the book. It is not a story constructed with art; it has no well-planned plot; the main characters have a certain force, but not much truth; it is a series of sketches of men and women, interspersed with anecdotes, narratives of adventure strung together—all told in a light, easy, gentlemanly style, with no tiresome delays, and not a dull page in the whole book.

Beyond this, the scenes in Ireland have great merit. Rebecca Graham is one of the best Irish girls that recent story-writers have given us, and she manages her flirtations with an amount of humour, frankness, and finesse to which Englishwomen rarely attain. The contrast, too, between the characters in the opening chapters of the book gives great variety and interest to it; Maitland's style of love-making is so different from that of his blunt boyish rival, and Alice Trafford does her coquetry with a refinement to which Miss Graham cannot pretend. Even in the sketches of Doctor Stewart and the widow Butler, slight as they are, there are touches that show power. When the author leaves these scenes, however, we have nothing but the old story—wild adventures of Irish gentlemen in Italy, which, as everyone knows, invariably end in hairbreadth 'scapes and very astounding catastrophes to intending assassins. We have also, on two or three occasions, the very hackneyed and very absurd device of one of the characters listening by stealth to important conversations. Two young ladies discuss their love affairs in a balcony over the sea in a tone so loud that the lover of one of them, gliding by in a boat, overhears the whole discourse; on another occasion important State secrets are betrayed to an enemy in the same way. But after all the faults we can think of, we cannot deny that the book has amused us in many chapters, and though we could have laid it down without any pang of suspended curiosity, it so happens that we did not. So that our author may find in us, if not an enthusiastic eulogist, very nearly Sterne's *beau idéal* of a critic, "pleased he knows not why, and cares not wherefore."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We beg leave to state that it is impossible for us to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

NOTICE.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any News-agent, on the day of publication.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—On Monday Evening next, February 2, a BEETHOVEN NIGHT. The Programme will include the Kreutzer Sonata, for Violin and Piano; the Sonata in C minor, Op. 111, for Piano; the Serenade Trio, for Violin, Viola, and Violoncello; and the Quartet in B flat, Op. 18. Pianoforte, Madame Arabella Goddard; Violin, Herr Straus (his last appearance); Vocalist, Mr. Sims Reeves. Conductor, Mr. Benfield. Sofa Stalls, 5s.; Balcony, 3s.; Admission, 1s.—Tickets at Chappell & Co., 50 New Bond Street; Cramer & Co.'s, Keith & Co.'s; and at the Hall, 35 Piccadilly.

MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—MORNING PERFORMANCES, Saturdays, March 11, 18, and 25, 1865.—In compliance with the request of many persons, and for the accommodation of those who are unable to attend in the Evening, the Director begs to announce that THREE MORNING PERFORMANCES will be given on Saturdays, March 11, 18, and 25, 1865, to commence at Three o'clock precisely. Herr Joachim, Herr L. Ries, Mr. H. Webb, and Signor Fattil will appear at all of these Concerts. Madame Arabella Goddard and Mr. Charles Hallé will be the Pianists. Subscribers' Tickets are available for the whole of these Performances without any charge. Sofa Stalls, 5s.; Balcony, 3s.; Admission, 1s.—Tickets may be had of Chappell & Co., 50 New Bond Street; Austin, 25 Piccadilly; Cramer & Co., Regent Street; Keith, Provan, & Co., 48 Chancery.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—GREAT TRIENNIAL HANDEL FESTIVAL 1865. at the Crystal Palace, about the end of June. Registers have been opened at the Crystal Palace, Sydenham, S.E., and at Exeter Hall, Strand, London, W.C., for entering the Names of Persons desirous of receiving early Copies of the Programme of the Festival, the Issue and Prices of Tickets, Plans and Arrangements of Reserved Seats, &c. Letters addressed to the Underigned will meet with due attention.

GEO. GROVE, Sec. Crystal Palace Company.
THOS. BREWER, Hon. Sec. Sacred Harmonic Society.

WILL CLOSE SATURDAY, MARCH 18.

SOCIETY OF PAINTERS IN WATER COLOURS.—The ANNUAL WINTER EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES by the Members, at their Gallery, 5 Pall Mall East. Nine till dusk.—Admission, 1s.

GEORGE A. FRIPP, Secretary.

THE LATE DAVID ROBERTS, R.A.—An EXHIBITION of the WORKS of this eminent Artist, consisting of Paintings, Drawings, and Sketches in Oil and Water Colour, is NOW OPEN to the Public, at 9 Conduit Street, Regent Street, from Ten to Five.—Admission, 1s.

WELSH CHARITY SCHOOLS of the Most Honourable and Royal Society of ANCIENT BRITONS.—Patron, the QUEEN.—The 150th ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL will be celebrated on Tuesday, February 28, 1865.—Ash Wednesday falling this Year on St. David's Day—at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen Street, at six o'clock.

President of the Day.—Sir WATKIN WILLIAMS WYNN, Bart., M.P.

Vice-Presidents.—Col. Stantholme Browder, C.B.; William Hammer, Esq.; T. L. Fitz Hugh, Esq.; the Rev. T. Jones; Octavius Morgan, Esq., M.P.; John Durdale, Esq.; Chandos Wren Hookyns, Esq.; William Jones, Esq., F.R.S.; Lieut.-Colonel Madocks; R. Green Price, Esq., M.P.; John Taber, Esq.

Stewards.—Griffith Jones, Esq.; Chester; Charles Morgan, Esq.; Peter Roberts, Esq.; Griffith Jarrett, Esq.; Andrew Augustus Robinson, Esq.; Edward Williams, Esq.; Oswestry; Chas. Thos. Wootnam, Esq.

The Governors and Friends of the Charity will assemble at the School House, Ashford, Middlesex, for Divine Service, at 11½.

The Sermon will be preached by the Rev. C. W. Furse, Vicar of Staines.

The Children will dine at 1½. Luncheon for Visitors at 1½.

Trains stopping this day at Ashford will leave Waterloo Road at 10.30 and 12.45.

Trains to London from Ashford at 7½, reaching London at 11.30.

Dinner and Ladies' Tickets to be had of the Secretary.

The Musical Arrangements will include the Band of the Royal Artillery.

Office, 55 Charing Cross, S.W.

THE ARCHITECTURAL MUSEUM, SOUTH KENSINGTON MUSEUM, W.—SESSION 1865.

MEETING AND LECTURES.

Tuesday, March 7.—DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES TO ART-WORKMEN, with an ADDRESS on the PEOPLE'S SHARE in ART. By A. J. B. BARNARDON HORS, Esq., LL.D., D.C.L., President.

Tuesday, March 11.—WOMEN and the FINE ARTS. By F. T. PALGRAVE, Esq.

Tuesday, April 4.—CHURCH BELLS, their ANTIQUITIES and CONNECTION with ARCHITECTURE. By the Rev. JOHN H. SPENCER, M.A., Rector of Westbourne, Sussex.

Tuesday, April 19.—DECORATION as a HANDMAID to ARCHITECTURE. By the Very Rev. Canon Beece, D.D.

Tuesday, May 2.—ANCIENT CHRISTIAN TOWNS in CENTRAL SYRIA, recently DISCOVERED by COUNT M. DE VOGUE. By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

Tuesday, May 16.—THE PERICENT of a GOTHIC MINSTER. By the Rev. MACKENZIE E. C. WATSON, M.A., Professor and Prebendary of Chichester.

The Chair will be taken on each Evening at Eight o'clock.

Art-Workmen may obtain Cards of Admission by enclosing a Directed and Stamped Envelope to the Hon. Sec., JOSEPH CLARKE, Esq., 13 Stratford Place, London, W.

A. J. B. BARNARDON HOPE, President.

GEO. GILBERT SCOTT, Treasurer.

JOSEPH CLARKE, Hon. Sec.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, London, 67 and 68 Harley Street, W.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1853, for the General Education of LADIES, and for granting Certificates of Knowledge.

Patrons.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

H.R.H. THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

Visitor.—THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

Principal.—THE DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

Lady Resident.—Miss PARRY.

The Half Term for the College and School will begin on Monday, February 28.

Arrangements are made for receiving Boarders.

Prospectuses, with full particulars, may be had on application to Mrs. WILLIAMS, at the College Office.

E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A., Dean.

THE HERMITAGE, Richmond, S.W.—An OXFORD

GRADUATE, assisted by eminently qualified Teachers, carefully and rapidly Prepares a small number of GENTLEMEN'S SONS for the Universities, Woolwich, Sandhurst, and the Civil Service. The Junior Department has a few Vacancies.

WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, AND THE LINE EXAMINATIONS.

MR. WREN, M.A. Cambridge, receives TEN RESIDENT

PUPILS. The only Two sent up for the last Sandhurst Examination passed 4th and 19th; and the only One for the last Woolwich Examination, 34th.—Wiltshire House, Angel Park, Brighton.

WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, DIRECT COMMISSIONS.

CANDIDATES are Prepared by A. D. SPRANGE, M.A., 19 Princess Square, Baywater, W. At the last Woolwich Examination his Two Pupils were Successful.

MILITARY EDUCATION at BROMSGROVE HOUSE,

Croydon, under the Superintendence of Rev. W. H. JOHNSTONE, M.A., for Nineteen years Professor, Examiner, and Chaplain at the late Military College, Addiscombe. There are now TWO VACANCIES, as two Gentlemen have just passed from this Establishment for Woolwich.

MILITARY TUTORAGE for FIRST-CLASS CANDI-

DATES.—THREE VACANCIES.—Monthly: Twelve Guineas; including High Mathematics, Latin, Greek, English, French history, Geography, Drawing. Or, Fifteen Guineas, with German, Fortification, and Extra.—Address, PRINCIPAL, 75 St. Stephen's Square, Baywater.

CIVIL SERVICE of INDIA.—THREE VACANCIES at

No. 7 St. Stephen's Square, Baywater. Terms Monthly, "without extra." Fifteen Guineas, including sound instruction in all necessary Subjects, and very superior Residence.—See the PRINCIPAL, for further particulars.

THE INDIAN and HOME CIVIL SERVICES, Woolwich,

Sandhurst, and the Line.—CLASSES for Pupils preparing for the above: Terms moderate.—Address, MATHEMATICAL, 14 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, W.

THE REV. J. J. MANLEY, M.A. (Etonian), Graduate in

Honour, Exeter College, Oxford (1842), receives SIX GENTLEMEN for the Universities and Orders. Two Vacancies.—Address, Cottered Rectory, Buntingford, Herts.

GERMANY.—A GRADUATE (M.A.) of Cambridge, residing at Coblenz on the Rhine, for the Education of his Family, receives a limited number of PRIVATE PUPILS, to whom he offers every facility for acquiring the German and French Languages, with the comforts of an English Home.—References permitted to the Rt. Rev. Bishop Nixson, Bishop of Exeter, near York, and to the Parents of former Pupils.—Address, B. A. Buxton, Esq., Coblenz, Rhine.

EDUCATION for YOUNG LADIES at GRANDSON, Switzerland.—At this Establishment (founded in 1815), conducted by Madame CHATELAIN (Widow of the late Rev. Chatelain), YOUNG LADIES receive a thoroughly careful and Christian Education, with the Comforts of Home. The Climate is healthy and agreeable, and the Residence is surrounded by Gardens and Meadows for the Recreation of the Pupils, who are in every respect treated as a portion of the Family. The View is extensive, comprehending the Lake of Neuchâtel, the Alps, &c. Board and Instruction (including German), 1,200 Francs per Annum; or with Piano and Drawing, 1,400 Francs.—References to the English Chaplain, Rev. J. Basset, Montreux, Switzerland; Miss Seaton, at Mrs. Bourne's, Uplands, Belvedere Park, Upper Norwood; Miss CRAMER, Clergy Daughters' School, Great George Street, Bristol.

HOME TUITION.—The RECTOR of an Agricultural Parish receives into his Family SIX BOYS between Seven and Twelve Years of Age, to be prepared for the Public Schools by a Resident Tutor, a Graduate of Cambridge. The Rectory-house is large, the Grounds extensive, and the Situation most healthy.—Address, Rev. W. B., care of Mr. F. S. de C. Besson, 70 Berners Street, Oxford Street.

TUITION by the Sea, on the South Coast.—The Rev. T. L. MONTEFIORE (M.A. Trin. Coll. Camb.), Rector of Catherston, Dorset, has a Vacancy for a Third PUPIL (between the ages of Fourteen and Eighteen) who is determined to Work Classics, &c., and French. Terms, £150 per Annum.—Address, Charmouth, Dorset.

PRIVATE TUTOR (Visiting).—A Gentleman, who has success- fully prepared several Candidates for Competitive and other Examinations, can attend to One Additional PUPIL (Two Hours every Morning). Excellent references, and reasonable terms.—Address, TROUS, 70 Davies Street, Berkeley Square, W.

LEAMINGTON COLLEGE.—A MATHEMATICAL MASTER will be required at this College at Easter. School experience required in addition to good University Degree. Salary, £150, with Private Pupils about £20.—Applications to be made to the Secretary, on or before Saturday, March 18. Leamington, February 10, 1865.

A GENTLEMAN, thoroughly acquainted with the Trade in all his Departments, WANTED, to take the Management of an Extensive and Old-established STATIONERY and BOOKSELLING BUSINESS. He must have a good Address, and possess Energy to enable him to extend the Business in both Branches, and undertake its full Control. The highest character for Integrity and Ability required. Salary not on object.—Apply by letter, addressed B. C., care of Davies & Co., Advertising Agents, 1 Inch Lane, Cornhill.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS CLUB.—The Committee will proceed to ELECT, on or before April 5, FIFTY additional MEMBERS. Gentlemen who have been educated at Charter-house, Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Westminster, or Winchester are alone eligible.—Apply to the SECRETARY, 17 St. James's Place, S.W.

BRITISH HOME for INCURABLES, Clapham Rise, S.

Patrons.—H.R.H. THE PRINCESS OF WALES.

Bankers (Messrs. BARCLAY, BEVAN, & CO., 54 Lombard Street, E.C.; and Messrs. COULTS & CO., 39 Strand, W.C.)

A Home for Life, with every domestic comfort and medical attendance, is provided for the hopelessly incurable, more particularly for those who have formerly been in prosperity.

The Home, at Clapham Rise, is in full operation, and the public are invited to visit it.

Patients admitted on payment. Annuities of £30 also granted. Contributions are earnestly solicited in aid of this Charity, which extends to all parts of the kingdom.

Full particulars and Forms of Application may be obtained from the Secretary.

Office, 73 Chapside, E.C., Jan. 7, 1865. EDWARD WEAVER, Secretary.

HYDROPATHIC SANATORIUM, SUDBROOK PARK, Rich-

mond Hill, Surrey.—Physician, Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Univ.—For the treatment of Chronic Diseases, by the combined Natural Agents, Air, Exercise, Water, and Diet. The Turkish Baths on the Premises, under Dr. Lane's Medical Direction.

FEMALE COPYISTS' OFFICES, 2 Chichester Rents,

Lincoln's Inn.—WRITINGS of every description COPIED, at about half the charges made at other Offices.

LAW.—GREAT SAVING.—ABSTRACTS COPIED at 8d.

per Sheet; Abbreviated Copies, 2s. 3d. per 20 Follios; Deeds and full Copies, 2d. per Folio. A Discount of one-fourth for prompt payment reduces the charges to 6d. per Sheet for printed, 1d. per Sheet for Draft, and 1d. per Sheet for Deeds and full Copies.

Copies. Net price of Paper—Foolscap, 1d. per Sheet; Draft, 6d. per Sheet.—ROBERT KERR, Law Stationer, 81 Chancery Lane, W.C.

THE FARNLEY HALL "TURNERS."—Messrs. P. & D.

COLNAGHI, SCOTT, & CO. beg leave to announce that they are now publishing a Selection of FIFTY of the most important DRAWINGS from this celebrated Collection, reproduced in Photography by Messrs. L. CALDER & CO. Size of the Work, 25 in. by 15 in. Price, 1 Guinea.

"We turn from one to the other with fresh wonder and delight at the success of Messrs. Calder, who have done a national service by producing this work."—*Athenaeum*.

January 28, 1865.

THE MAGIC DONATO.—Life-like Figures of the Wonderful

Donato, and La Premiere Danseuse, which Dance when placed on the ground, without any visible aid, defying detection. The Pair sent post free for 14 Stamps.—H. G. CLARKE & CO., 252 Strand.

THE MAGIC DONKEYS.—Roars of Laughter.—These

wonderful Animals go through their Extraordinary Evolutions Daily, at 252 Strand, from Ten till Five. The Pair sent post free for 14 Stamps. The Magic Punch and Judy with the Dog Toby, post free for 20 Stamps.—H. G. CLARKE & CO., 252 Strand.

MONEY ADVANCED TO Noblemen and Gentlemen, Heirs to

Estates, Officers, &c.—Address (letter only), Mr. HOLLAND, 6 Staple Inn, Chancery Lane.

FINANCIAL AGENCY.—Established 1847.—Loans by way

of Mortgage on Freehold, Leasehold, or Reversionary Property; Ground-rents, Life Interests, Legacies, &c., purchased; Capital raised for Public Companies. Securities to pay from 1 to 20 per cent. obtained without delay. Solicitors, Capitalists, or others desiring either to borrow or invest may send particulars of their requirements to Mr. HOWE, 11 Beaufort Buildings, Strand.

MONEY.—£10,000.—Immediate ADVANCES are MADE

to Officers in the Army and others with security and dispatch, by a Private Gentleman, upon Note of Hand, Life Interests, Reversions, Legacies, Land, Houses, or other Property. Interest, 5 per cent.—Apply (confidentially) to Mr. WATSON, 6 Norris Street, St. James's, S.W.

£25,000.—A Private Gentleman is prepared to ADVANCE

the above Amount in Sums of £100 and upwards, to Noblemen, Gentlemen, Officers on full pay, Heirs to entailed Estates, Clergymen, and others, on their Personal Security only. Also, some TRUST MONEY to be advanced for any period of time on bank file Securities, at 4 to 5 per cent.—Apply by letter only, in strict confidence, to H. W., 21 Bury Street, St. James's, S.W.

STAINED GLASS WINDOWS for Churches and Dwellings.

HEATON, BUTLER, & BAYNE'S new CATALOGUE, containing 18 pages of Illustrations, including completed Windows of the highest character; also Church Decorations and Memorial Brasses, now publishing, 3s. 6d. post free.—Heaton, Butlers, & Bayne, New King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND DOMESTIC DECORATION, &c.

HARLAND & FISHER, 83 Southampton Street, Strand,

W.C., Ecclesiastical Decorators, &c., and Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH and DOMESTIC MEDIEVAL FURNITURE, Paper Hangings, &c. Designs and Estimates furnished, or an Illustrated Price Catalogue, upon application. Robes, Surplices, &c.

WRIGHT & MANSFIELD, Decorators, Cabinet Makers, and

Upholsters, 3 Great Portland Street, and Portland Works, Little Riding House Street. First Class Medal 1862 awarded for "Great Excellence of Design and Workmanship."

COUNCIL MEDAL, 1851.—FIRST CLASS MEDAL, 1855.—

PRIZE MEDAL, 1857. The above Medals have been awarded to SMITH, BECK, & BECK, who have REMOVED from 6 Coleman Street, to 31 Cornhill, E.C., where they have opened extensive Show Rooms containing large assortments of Achromatic Microscopes, Stereoscopes, and all classes of Optical, Meteorological, and other Scientific Instruments and Apparatus.—Catalogues sent on receipt of six postage stamps.

RODRIGUES' MONOGRAMS and HERALDIC DEVICES,

Designed and Engraved as Gems of Art. Steel Dies Engraved.—NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES Stamped in Colour Relief, and illuminated in the most elegant Style.

C. and 100 Superfine Cards printed for 4d. each.

WEDDING CARDS, WEDDING ENVELOPES, BALL PROGRAMMES, CARDS, and BILLS of FARE, Printed and Stamped with Crest or Address, in the latest Fashion.

At HENRY RODRIGUES', 41 PICCADILLY, LONDON, two doors from Sackville Street.